University of Alberta

Until the Conversion of the Jews: The Apocalyptic Thought of Joachim of Fiore--A Reassessment

by

Sandro Adrian DiMarcello

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

in

History

Department of History and Classics

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2002

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-81301-0

Canada

ABSTRACT

Abbot Joachim of Fiore's *Adversus Iudeos* assigns a specific role to Jews at the end of time. He is critical about Judaic beliefs and addresses all Jews in the manner of the prophets from the Old Testament. It is time to put the treatise in its proper historical and religious context. I believe that a reassessment of Joachim's apocalyptic thought will force thorough reconsideration of the scholarly consensus in the tradition of Bernard McGinn and Robert E. Lerner. I propose to examine Joachim's treatise in light of standard medieval Christian works written about the Jews. A study of this nature will prove how orthodox or how heretical Joachim's opinions were. This analysis will allow historians a window through which one may understand his apocalyptic nature and the importance of medieval apocalyptic spirituality to the great thinkers of the time.

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Until the Conversion of the Jews: The Apocalyptic Thought of Joachim of Fiore--A Reassessment submitted by Sandro Adrian DiMarcello in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Dr. Andrew Colin Gow

Dr. John Kitchen

Dr. Christine McWebb

Dr. Jennifer Jay

August 19, 2002

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Sandro Adrian DiMarcello

Title of Thesis: Until the Conversion of the Jews: The Apocalyptic Thought of Joachim of Fiore--A Reassessment

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2002

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

8621-158a Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5Z-3B7

August 19, 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Andrew Colin Gow for his expertise and guidance. He has been an unwavering source of wisdom. I would also like to thank Dr. John Kitchen for his inspiration and support. I first encountered Joachim of Fiore and the Spiritual Franciscans in his apocalypticism course. That experience inspired me to continue my studies. I am indebted to several others who have provided constant encouragement and optimism; thank you all.

To all of my friends and family who have nurtured my creative leanings, I am profoundly grateful to you. This thesis is dedicated to my departed grandfather, Alessandro DiMarcello. Despite his humble life as a farmer in Italy, he had a passion for reading and writing, and kept a diary of his family's achievements that he made available to his loved ones before his death. *Questa tesi è un omaggio a te, caro Nonno.*

CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Chapter 1: *Contra Iudeos*? Joachim and the Jewish Question..... 11

Chapter 2: Joachim and Christian Traditions..... 36

Chapter 3: Religious Toleration and Apologetics..... 47

Chapter 4: Establishing Joachim's Historical Value..... 71

Chapter 5: Heterodoxy and Heresy: the Condemnation of Joachimism..... 83

Conclusion..... 100

Bibliography..... 104

INTRODUCTION

In the early stages of the Third Crusade, Richard the Lionhearted summoned a famous "prophet" who was renowned for his prophetic visions. Richard's chronicler, Roger de Hoveden, briefly described this encounter:

> "For he was a man learned in the Holy Scriptures, and interpreted the visions of Saint John the Evangelist, which Saint John has related in the Book of Revelation, which he wrote with his own hands; in hearing which, [Richard I] the king of England and his people took great delight".[1]

That man was Joachim, abbot of Corazzo. Joachim was preoccupied with the Apocalypse and the spiritual reading of Scripture as a means of salvation. With the passing of the second millennium, historians are speculating about the past and the relevance of apocalypticism. What have we learned about medieval spirituality and its apocalyptic implications? Medievalists and theologians are quick to defer to standard Augustinian readings of the end of time as unknowable and unpredictable. Yet, one of medieval Christianity's greatest legacies was a rich apocalyptic tradition dating back to the early Church Fathers. Even though the future was uncertain, some of the most complex apocalyptic beliefs originated in western Europe. Joachim was one of the most influential of these thinkers.

It is fair to say that Joachim's apocalyptic thought is at once extremely complex and frequently elusive. His interpretation of Scripture could have as many as fifteen

---

[1] Roger de Hoveden, trans. Henry T. Reilly, *The Annals de Roger of Hoveden Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201*, 2nd Edition (New York: AMS Press, 1853) 177. This meeting occurred in 1191 at Messina, Sicily, while Richard was traveling through Italy on his way to Jerusalem.

different interpretations from both Testaments. It is no surprise that historians of apocalypticism still have differing opinions about the relevance of Joachim's work. What are we to make of his relevance as a medieval biblical exegete, the effect of his thoughts on Christianity, or his interpretations of the Apocalypse?

Any study of Joachism is problematic as a result of the variety of complex writings attributed to the Abbot.[2] While his influence on apocalypticism still remains undeniable, most of the scholarship to date has been loathe to examine his work on a more minute level. If historians were to take a closer look at some of his minor works which have escaped the attention of academics at large, especially a work beyond the scope of the *Psalterium Decem Cordarum*, *Liber Figurarum*, *Liber Concordie*, or the

---

[2] There have been many excellent studies on the subject of Joachimism. For more information on Joachim of Fiore and the influence of Joachimism, see Ernesto Buonaiuti, *Gioacchino da Fiore, i tempi, la vita, il messagio* (Rome: Collezione Meridionale Editrice, 1931); David Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: a Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993); Antonio Crocco, *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioachimismo* (Naples: Liguori, 1976); E.R. Daniel, "Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario" in *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, Caroline Walker Bynum and Paul Freedman, eds., (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Decima Douie, *The Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Manchester: AMS Press, 1932); Francesco Foberti, *Gioacchino da Fiore. Nuovi studi critici sulla misitca e la religione in Calabria* (Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1934), *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioachinismo antico e moderno* (Padua: Casa editrice dott. A. Milani, 1942); Paul Fournier, *Joachim de Flore et Ses Doctrines* (Paris: Picard, 1909); Herbert Grundmann, *Neue Forschungen über Joachim von Floris* (Marburg: Simons, 1950), *Studien über Joachim von Floris* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927); M. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty* (London: S.P.C.K., 1961); Harold Lee, Marjorie Reeves, and Giulio Silano, *Western Mediterranean Prophecy* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1989); Robert E. Lerner, "Refreshment of the Saints: The Time After Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought" in *Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion*, Edwin A. Quain et al, eds., vol. XXXII (New York: Fordham University Press, 1976); Raoul Manselli, *La 'Lectura Super Apocalipsim' di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi* (Rome: Roma Nella sede dell'Istituto , 1955); Marjorie Reeves and Warwick Gould, *Joachim of Fiore and the Myth of the Eternal Evangel in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); Marjorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972); Marjorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future* (London: S.P.C.K., 1976), *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study of Joachimism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); Francesco Russo, *Gioacchino da Fiore e le fondazioni florensi in Calabria* (Naples: F. Fiorentino, 1958); Leone Tondelli, *Il Libro delle Figure dell'Abate Gioacchino*, vol.i, 2nd ed. (Turin: Società editrice internazionale, 1953); and Delno C. West, ed., *Joachim of Fiore in Christian Thought* 2 vols. (New York: Burt Franklin and Co., 1975).

Expositio In Apocalypsim, one might learn a lot about Joachim's general sense of apocalypticism. A study of one of his treatises might force historians to re-examine Joachim's supposed irenic visions of the third status. Although it is quite difficult to argue that one of Joachim's minor works can legitimately undermine the bulk of his general apocalyptic views, the historiographical treatment of this work may reveal more about how historians perceive Joachim's importance than about historians' specific perceptions of the Abbot. This historical perception becomes even more problematic in light of the contentious claims of some of the most well-respected scholars in the field.

It is time that Joachim's lesser-known works receive more attention. One of his most telling minor works, which speaks to his orthodoxy, his overall irenic view of the third status, and his sense of urgency to actualize the Apocalypse, is the treatise entitled *Adversus Iudeos.* Joachim addresses what he understands as the erroneous interpretations of Jews on three fronts: the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, and the literal interpretation of Scripture, particularly the Old Testament. Joachim reproaches Jews for their clouded judgement and for the hardness of their hearts; he assumes the tone of an Old Testament prophet as he attempts to persuade Jews to convert to Christianity. His efforts at conversion hint at his eagerness to initiate the Apocalypse and the third status which follows it. On the evidence of this treatise, I believe that one of Joachim's primary concerns is the realization of the Apocalypse, and in particular, his distinctive role in it.

Therefore, the treatise is extremely important as a catalyst to the actualization of the rest of Joachim's theological doctrines. Primarily, he takes his cues from Augustine's *De Civitate Dei,* especially book 20, in which Augustine claims that the Jews must

convert before Elijah comes down from the heavens. The importance of conversion is undeniable. Thus, this stage of the fulfillment of the Apocalypse, in which Jews convert to Christianity, is a vital cog in the progression of his doctrine of salvation. On this merit alone, this treatise demands closer attention. If the work was important to Joachim's ideas about the progression of the history of salvation, we must give it the attention it is due.

The only attempt to deal with this work until recently has been Beatrice Hirsch-Reich's article "Joachim von Fiore und das Judentum". She argued that Joachim's vision for a Judeo-Christian alliance in the final status was predominantly peaceful. Most recently, Robert E. Lerner espoused the same interpretation as Hirsch-Reich. He claimed that Joachim was an exception of sorts in a society that was otherwise unkind toward Jews. He stated that Joachim believed in a type of 'philo-Judaism', or more accurately, it was a "relatively more benign attitude toward the Jews than the late medieval Christian norm".[3] In my opinion, this type of phraseology is too vague to be of any use. In fact, it is as general as Norman Cohn's supposed argument that all medieval millenarians were anti-Semites - and Lerner took issue with the ambiguity of such a general statement.[4] However, if one considers the timbre of Joachim's address, the subsequent *figurae* in the *Liber Figurarum* that explain his views toward Jews, and his apocalyptic nature, it is slightly misleading to argue that Joachim's conception of the third status is 'irenic'.

As for other scholars of Joachimism, very little attention has been given to

---

[3] Robert E. Lerner, *The Feast of St. Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000) 120. Lerner originally finds fault with R.I. Moore's claim that western Europe was a persecuting society between 1100 and 1250 and argues that Joachim and his followers were exceptions to this perspective.

[4] Lerner 3. Although Lerner's argument is levelled against those who assume that all medieval millenarians were anti-Semites, he does not cite any of Cohn's scholarship to support his argument.

Joachim's treatise against the Jews. Marjorie Reeves claimed that the treatise is a minor work. Bernard McGinn made the same point, and merely added that the work is mentioned in his 'Testament', "an interesting contribution to the anti-Jewish polemics that had proliferated for a century or more, especially because the Abbot had much greater hopes for the Jews than most of his contemporaries".[5] Lerner commended McGinn for this idea. In this regard, McGinn took the same line of argument as Lerner did; Joachim is the exception to what occurred throughout western Europe.

Strangely enough, McGinn added this point about the treatise: "the treatise was written not only to answer Jewish attacks on Christian beliefs, as were most of the works against the Jews...".[6] Why did McGinn make this claim without offering any evidence to prove that Joachim was provoked to write this treatise as a result of Jewish attacks? Despite Joachim's connection to charges of heresy, is it right to assume that because Christianity and Judaism share a common apocalyptic heritage that he is innocent by association? McGinn's attempt to associate Christianity's apocalyptic heritage to a Jewish precedent is obvious. He claimed that the Christian fascination about the meaning of history "grew out of intertestamental Jewish apocalyptic eschatology".[7] These statements make it seem as though Joachim wrote this response in order to address a common problem unique to Christianity - a justified response to supposed Jewish attacks on the Christian religion. If this were true, Joachim would have as much right as John

---

[5] Bernard McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1985) 35.
[6] McGinn 35.
[7] McGinn 51.

Chrysostomus to defend the faith against such unmitigated attacks. Chrysostomus' invective can be described as anti-Semitic as well as anti-Judaic. He spoke very little about an impending Apocalypse and the need for Jewish conversion. The inherent problems in penetrating this shelved treatise are manifold. One wonders why *Adversus Iudeos* has not merited more attention in the scholarly literature. Although I readily admit that there is a plethora of research topics available to the historian if he or she should choose to study Joachim or Joachimism in any capacity, to neglect an important work like the *Adversus Iudeos* is an injustice to Joachim's distinctiveness as a spiritual exegete who learned from the works of the Church Fathers and whose revelations were intended to show Christians how to read Scripture and achieve eternal salvation. *Adversus Iudeos* is awash in a cloud of discourses designed to focus attention on the innovations of the Abbot in an effort to make him appear worthy to be called a major Christian thinker. The debate over his orthodoxy is another problem which resurfaces from time to time in Joachim scholarship, and I believe it is intimately linked to the academic rhetoric designed to exonerate the Abbot of any transgressions that might tarnish his ideal Christian image. So much attention has been given to these issues that scholars have lost sight of the treatise against the Jews as a step to achieve the third status, the time of irenic unity, the time of judgement, and the time of salvation. This thesis will address all of these matters to show that Joachim was primarily an apocalyptically-minded monk, and as such, his insistence that the Jews convert to Christianity was a major cog in the engine of the history of salvation.

This thesis is written partly in response to McGinn's mistreatment of this source

and to make a case against Lerner's opinion that Joachim and his disciples were exceptions to a persecuting society because of his possible Jewish heritage and the possibility that he was a baptized Jew to which he refers in a vague fashion. The academic discourse about Joachim's Christian orthodoxy seems inflated and self-aggrandizing; even though Joachim cannot be considered truly orthodox, Christian scholars like Bernard McGinn seem anxious to lay claim to Joachim's greatness as a Christian thinker first, and an innovator second.[8] There is no doubt that Joachim's influence was far-reaching and original, but the effort to peg him as one of Christianity's greatest thinkers deserves careful examination. Thus, a comparison of Joachim's thoughts to those of other major Christian thinkers, such as Bernard of Clairvaux, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostomus, Hilary of Poitiers, and Gregory the Great, is necessary.

Although McGinn and Lerner were quite right to state that Joachim was an apocalyptic optimist, he was very selective about the membership in the group of Christians he thought were destined to be saved. Unlike McGinn and Lerner, I would argue that Joachim was scornful of Judaism for apocalyptic reasons; he desperately sought the conversion of Jews. He was not lenient to those who could not be converted, but despite this fact, scholars have not engaged the topic of Joachim's 'anti-Judaic' sentiments. I believe that a trend is discernible in Christian scholarship: one which tends to divert attention away from any anti-Judaic ethic because it seems to be an embarrassment in comparison to Joachim's modern liberal sentiments, representative of a more tolerant state of religion. In the spirit of Pope John Paul II's recent public apology to

---

[8] McGinn 235. McGinn makes his final claim toward the end of the book.

Jews worldwide for their mistreatment over centuries on behalf of Christianity *in toto*, modern western scholars have not addressed the issue of Joachim's anti-Judaic sentiments in tracts like *Adversus Iudeos*.

Furthermore, McGinn's and Lerner's opinions contradict the numerous studies of Jewish scholars such as Jeremy Cohen and Solomon Grayzel which confirm R.I. Moore's claim that western Europe had a persecuting mentality toward those on the margins of Christian society. Perspectives that make claims for Joachim's benign attitude toward Jews grossly underestimate Joachim's apocalyptic faith and undermine the true impetus behind his treatise: namely, to welcome the Apocalypse and the third status.

I believe that Joachim assigned a paramount role to himself in the third status. He had more at stake than just the salvation of Christian souls, including his own. As Marjorie Reeves concluded from her analysis of the *Liber Concordie*, he envisioned a conversion of the masses, not exclusively Jews and Christians, to a new spiritual understanding - one that could be realized through extensive preaching before the advent of the Antichrist.[9] As both Bernard McGinn and E.R. Daniel noted, this great feat was to be accomplished by the *viri spirituales*, formed by two groups of monks: contemplatives and preachers. It is curious that Joachim did not address any other groups which were destined for salvation; he addressed only the Jews with such marked scorn.

I propose to examine Joachim's anti-Judaic tendencies in the treatise, in his writings, and in his *figurae*. I will test Lerner's conclusion that Joachim was sympathetic

---

[9] Reeves, *Prophecy* 140. Reeves' understanding of Joachim's work is usually accepted as the standard in Joachimist studies. The point to make is that Joachim reserved a special role for himself as a catalyst to a spiritual understanding in the third status as one who preaches toward that end.

to Jews in the final days. My purpose will be not only to gain a new perspective on the nature of the Abbot's thoughts about Jews and Judaism, but to gain an understanding of the way in which his disciples, namely, the Spiritual Franciscans, regarded Jews and the Apocalypse. I will demonstrate how the Spiritual Franciscans' ongoing debate with the papacy added to a sense of Joachimist heresy.

This is not to undermine Joachim's influence in any way; on the contrary. To this end, this thesis will survey the monk's personal life and accomplishments, his doctrines, and how his theology compares to that of the Church Fathers and Doctors. While it is true that historians can understand Joachim either as a radical Christian thinker or an outright heretic, the subsequent interpretation of his doctrines posed a threat to orthodoxy after the Abbot's death in 1202, regardless of the Abbot's intentions. I would argue that Joachim's work was more readily associated with heresy after the verdict of 1215 despite the Abbot's purpose; there must be a distinction between Joachim's noble objectives and the various interpretations of his work in general. In the hands of comparatively more radical thinkers like Gerardino of Borgo San Donnino or Ubertino da Casale, Joachim's doctrines were manipulated in such a way as to benefit the Franciscan order and label Church magnates as evildoers. It is safe to assume that Joachim thought that he was acting in the best interests of Christianity and of mankind, if I read him correctly, because he wanted to spread the news that the Apocalypse was at hand and that people had to prepare themselves accordingly if they expected to be saved.

Scholars of apocalypticism are predisposed to brand the treatise as anti-Jewish invective, but it is imperative that historians avoid contentious claims that suggest

Joachim's notion of salvation was anti-Judaic. Definitions are difficult to put into practice, at least in this case, because the Abbot would not have known what anti-Semitism meant in twelfth-century Calabria. The notion of anti-Semitism is a modern construct and has little applicability to a Calabrian Abbot living on a mountain. However, to the extent that it addresses a type of belief in Scripture, this treatise is, by any definition, an attack on Judaic interpretations of Scripture *in toto*. This thesis uses this last point as a the general rubric for an analysis of the treatise. In no way is it meant to imply that Joachim was a Jew-hater in the modern sense of the term; on the contrary, he was concerned that those who were considered worthy to convert to Christianity before the Apocalypse should be prepared to do so immediately.

While it would be foolish to judge Joachim's doctrine of salvation based solely on *Adversus Iudeos*, the treatise demonstrates Joachim's sense of the proximity of the Apocalypse. There is an undeniable sense of urgency in the tone of Joachim's address as he prepares to help initiate the third status. I submit that this was his primary intention, and the main impetus behind the treatise. Lerner and Reeves demonstrated how Joachim's relevance as an exegete resonated throughout history, and indeed up to the present day. With this kind of reputation at stake, attempts to categorize the enigmatic Abbot have permeated Joachimist scholarship. Was this the wish of an isolated monk secluded on a mountain, to see how he would be eulogized in history? I suggest that it might be time to concentrate on what the Abbot's work *is not* in order to demonstrate what it *is*, and to that end, we must analyze the genius as well as the scandal.

1. *CONTRA IUDEOS*? JOACHIM AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

Joachim of Fiore had definite views regarding the role of the Jews at the end of time. In my opinion, Joachim cannot easily represent orthodoxy or heterodoxy. If, as I believe, his main preoccupation is the Apocalypse, he must have certain opinions about Jewish conversion to Christianity as a necessary stage in mankind's salvation. This chapter will explore his views to that end: how he addressed the Jews, the content of his argument, the purpose of his address, and the significance of it. It is important to read the document with an eye to Joachim's apocalypticism and his spiritual interpretation of Scripture especially, since this is Joachim's harshest criticism of the Jewish method of reading the Testaments. This analysis will lead to a comparison between Joachim's treatment of the Jews with that of his mentors, the Church Fathers, in the next chapter. Furthermore, I hope to demonstrate how Joachim's interpretation of Jewish conversion contradicts the essence of conversion itself as well as the bulk of Jewish scholarship on the subject of anti-Judaism in the high Middle Ages.

Throughout my analysis, I will make references to the terms anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. These terms, albeit modern inventions, are relevant when comparing Joachim's views to those of certain Church Fathers, such as John of Chrysostom. They will be brought to bear in my analysis of the type of academic discourse which surrounds the Joachimist orthodoxy controversy as well. Therefore, it would be grossly irresponsible of me to treat these distinct definitions simply as 'anti-Jewishness'; I think there is a difference between a critique of a faith as opposed to an attack on members of a

group in general. For my purposes, I offer the following definitions to these terms. Anti-Judaism in its simplest form will refer to a critical response toward Jews' religious beliefs. It is a judgement levied against a belief structure. Anti-Semitism in this context refers to a criticism against members of a social group. Although the distinction may be quite basic, modern scholars may have different interpretations about the way medieval Jews were perceived, and it is important to understand how Joachim's invective against Judaism employed well-established tropes of spiritual and literal interpretations of Scripture as a means of facilitating final conversion.

What was Joachim's attitude toward Judaism? I believe that Joachim demonstrated an obvious respect for the knowledge acquired by the chosen people of God. This figured directly in his doctrinal work. One of the most obvious examples of this respect is the use of the symbolic letters IEUE throughout his trinitarian models of history. This was an adaptation of the work of Petrus Alphonsi, who was a Spanish Jew. Alphonsi initially stated that the letters JHVH were symbolic of the Hebrew name of God. He claimed that the HV segment actually appeared in the Talmud as an abbreviation of this sacred Hebrew name; however, the tripartite divisions did not exist in Jewish thought. Alphonsi claimed to obtain this information of the name - Yod-He-Vav-He (IEUE) - from a little-known book called the *Secreta Secretorum*, or the Book Rasiel.[1] Joachim simply used these letters to explain the different periods under God's law: before the law (I), under the law (E), under the Gospels (U), and under the time of true knowledge, when all is revealed to mankind (E). Once again, Joachim drew upon

---

[1] McGinn 171.

Jewish sources to formulate his beliefs.

In a similar fashion, Joachim also used images of flourishing trees to illustrate his views about Jews and Judaism throughout history. One particular image which explained the relationship between Jews and Christians as well as the relationship between the two Testaments depicted Trinitarian tree circles. It showed a tree which had sprung from the head of Noah, who also represented God. Three main branches grew out of the head which represented Noah's three sons: Ham, Shem, and Japhet. Marjorie Reeves has offered an unparalleled interpretation of this image, in which Ham represented an abortive stump, Shem represented the *Populus Judaicus* (Jews and the Old Testament on the left branch), and Japhet represented the *Populus Gentilis* (Latins, Greeks, and the New Testament on the right branch).[2] At first, as the two branches formed a circle, the left branch appeared to have more foliage than the right in the first status. This was a time when Jews were favoured by God and when the Old Testament was in flower. However, during the second status, the branches crossed over and Japhet formed more foliage. This was a time when Christianity was favoured by God, and the New Testament was in flower. The third circle formed by the inter-twining branches displayed a great amount of foliage. This represented a time when the spiritual understanding of God would flourish: both the people and the Testaments would be united and come to full fruition.

Therefore, Joachim believed that the Jews would be reintegrated into the

---

[2] Reeves and Hirsch-Reich 170-173. In addition, see Delno C. West and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz, *Joachim of Fiore* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983) 14.

Christian flock before the end of the world could begin. He believed that Jews were still counted among the chosen people of God. In fact, Joachim's belief in a Jewish conversion was the fundamental impetus behind his treatise *Adversus Iudeos*. As E.R. Daniel has emphasized, Joachim became more convinced that the only way for these two groups to reconcile their differences in faith was through preaching. This was especially true after the failure of the Third Crusade and the rise of Saladin, who was associated with the sixth head of the dragon. Military might was ineffective, so Joachim suddenly thrust himself into the front line of the battle against unbelievers to act as the catalyst to a Judeo-Christian reunification.[3] However, Joachim did not believe that all Jews would convert to Christianity; some of them, along with some Gentiles, were reserved for the armies of Antichrist in the third status.

This belief was prevalent throughout Joachim's work. His depiction of the dragon with seven heads revealed how far the history of mankind had progressed. The great persecuting kings of Christianity were associated with the heads of the dragon: Herod, Nero, Constantinus, Mohammed, Melsemothus, Saladin, and an undetermined seventh head. By 1191, when Joachim met Richard I, the monk already believed that the final Antichrist had been born, and was located in the dragon's tail. As for the sixth head, Joachim equated mankind's current historical progress as contemporaneous with Saladin: "Saladin. The Sixth Persecution has Begun. The Seventh will Follow".[4] This would help to explain how Joachim must have felt about the impotence of military power after

---

[3] West 307-313.

[4] Bernard McGinn, trans., *Apocalyptic Spirituality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979) 136. "*Sexta persecutio inchoata est. VII. sequetur*".

Richard I fell to Saladin. The tail of the dragon was symbolic of Gog, the last Antichrist, not, however, associated with any particular group of people - though Jews were often associated with Gog (and Magog).[5] According to Joachim, Gog was the leader of an army of Antichrist which was composed of unbelievers - Jews or Gentiles. In this sense, evil dwelled in the hearts and minds of unbelievers, and these forces would have to be defeated before eternal peace could exist. Thus, a lack of an internal and spiritual faith was the main problem facing the Calabrian monk. The misinterpretation of Scripture was the main issue which Joachim addressed in his treatise against the Jews, for it was the root of all evil.

In essence, Joachim's greatest concern regarding the Jews was what he perceived as their literal interpretation of Scripture. If evil was working through these people, Joachim believed that it came from a lack of a spiritual understanding. Bernard McGinn briefly but accurately sketched this idea. According to McGinn:

> "The great enemy of the spiritual understanding...that is, the evil force at work in the world historical process, is not so much the external evil of war and persecution, but its inner dynamism, the intellectual error of... the literal interpretation of the Scriptures".[6]

This was what Joachim called a 'judaizing' of the text. The Old Testament was full of contradictions and absurdities which forced a deeper analysis of the text in order to understand the main message, according to Joachim. As McGinn pointed out, literal interpretation was an unproductive process because it took very little time to complete as

---

[5] See Andrew Colin Gow, *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995).
[6] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 126.

opposed to spiritual readings, which lasted a lifetime.[7] Thus, the monk implored Jews to read Scripture in the manner of contemplative monks to understand all the hidden meanings. This was one of the main motives that compelled Joachim to address the Jews.

As a result, Joachim's treatise became an anti-Jewish polemic against errors of interpretation, not a critical commentary on a personal way of life: a criticism of belief, not lifestyle. Marjorie Reeves, who authenticated the true manuscripts and assorted works which belonged to Joachim, stated that the treatise was part of Joachim's earlier works, probably written between 1180 and 1190.[8] This suggests that the conversion of the Jews was a thought which he had formulated early in his monastic life. In this sense, he was as traditional as the Church Fathers, especially Augustine. Moreover, Joachim began the treatise by appealing to the "ancient hardness" of the Jews.[9] From the beginning of the work, Joachim displayed his basic belief in a reconciliation between the two faiths, evident in the words "*...verum etiam quia adesse sentio tempus miserendi eis, tempus consolationis et conversionis eorum*".[10] The use of the gerund '*miserendi*' (active in meaning) demonstrated Joachim's willingness to actively convert Jews. He was in the process of accomplishing it. The gerund indicates a *doing*, an action: in this case, *forgiving*. He could have chosen to express this concern in the passive voice, or the gerundive, *to be forgiven*. In other words, the proximity of the action in this sentence was

---

[7] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 127.
[8] Reeves and Hirsch-Reich 48. Marjorie Reeves places his early works between 1180 and 1190.
[9] Gioacchino Da Fiore, *Agli Ebrei (Adversus Iudeos)* (Catanzaro: Rubbettino Editore, 1998) 44. The opening line of the treatise is "*Contra vetustam duritiam Iudeorum...*".
[10] Fiore 44. "*...because I think the time for forgiving them, the time for consolation and conversion is here*".

quite close to Joachim, like his general perception of the Apocalypse. It suggests that the action was in the process of completion.

Having stated this, Joachim addressed the first of three major concerns about Jews - the utter denial of the Christian Trinity. He cited prophets of the Old Testament to support his arguments throughout the treatise. However, the rejection of the Trinity was the most serious of the three concerns; this formed the foundation for Joachim's trinitarian view of history upon which all other beliefs were based.

Furthermore, he addressed these problems in prophetic style, as though he were Moses or Ezekiel. He cited the story of Genesis 18, in which the Lord appeared to Abraham on the plains of Mamre. Verse two explained that Abraham saw three men, not one. Joachim also cited Genesis 1, 26 to show that God made man in "our" image and not "his" image; this was positive proof that God was not just a solitary entity. Thus, Joachim's intention was to use the biblical texts which he claimed the Jews used most often in order to show how the text literally stated a triple dimension to God. He explained these corrections in the manner of a prophet scolding the *massa damnata*: "*si non trinitas ipsa Deus erat que apparuit Abrae in specie trium viorum, ut fingitis, o Iudei...*".[11] He also claimed that God sent his son to earth to represent the Word of God incarnate and that he often assumed the form of the angel of the Lord, as it is stated in Genesis 16, 7: "and the angel of the Lord found her [Sara] by a fountain of water in the wilderness...". Joachim showed how the same God spoke to them from the heavens in

---

[11] Fiore 48. "*If the same trinity, which appeared before Abraham in the semblance of three men, was not God but someone else, as you, oh Jews, incorrectly believe...*".

Genesis 21; therefore, he concluded that there must be more than one element to God. However, Joachim still maintained that two - father and son, God and angel, sender and messenger - formed one God, as it was once declared to Moses: "*audi, Israel, Deus tuus unus est*".[12] Therefore, God and Son were both separate and unified all at once.

Moreover, Joachim assigned a special role to the Holy Spirit in the Trinity. The Holy Spirit was specifically sent to mankind on earth, like the angel of the Lord. Unlike both the angel and the man, however, Joachim explained how the Spirit worked wonders that neither of the other two elements could - namely, a spiritual understanding of Scripture. Joachim linked the Spirit to Christianity as a justification of true faith by stating "thus, listen and understand how much more precious than gold is our [Christian] faith".[13] Joachim believed that the Jewish lack of faith in Christianity was inherited through their forefathers, who lacked a spiritual knowledge which God withheld from them. Joachim claimed that God left the faithless to wander the desert because of their lack of belief; thus, Joachim would also abandon those Jews who wish to follow the Antichrist, who would ultimately lose to the forces of God.

Secondly, Joachim addressed another problem facing the Jews: failure to believe in the incarnation of Christ as the Word of God. He claimed that the Word of God would last forever and formed the substance of life itself. The monk repeatedly claimed that Christians worshipped the same God as the Jews - the God of Abraham.[14] However, Joachim insisted that Christians spoke the Word of God with intellect and knowledge

---

[12] Fiore 72. "*Listen, Israel, your God is one*".
[13] Fiore 72. "*Audite ergo et intellegite quam sit auro purior fides nostra*".
[14] Fiore 74. "*...et nos ipsum adoramus, colimus, veneramur*".

which benefited the hearts of both the speaker and the listener. He compared the difference between words and knowledge to "water" and "river": rivers flow like words, never to come back again; but water flows and does not flow, proceeding and remaining, like knowledge.[15] This was how Joachim addressed what he perceived to be the Jewish misinterpretation of the Son and Word of God.

Joachim of Fiore also discussed the humanity of Christ. He compared Christ's duality to an olive tree which had been grafted[16]: the tree was one living being, but it still had two distinct aspects to it - humanity and divinity. Joachim used Psalm 45 to show how the anointed boy also had a throne in heaven; to Joachim, Christ was man and God. He also quoted Ezekiel 17, 22-24 to show how a twig from the top of a cedar which God pruned will be planted in fertile soil on a mountain over Israel, which demonstrated the monk's allegorical interpretation of Scripture. He compared the twig to Christ and the fertile ground to the Virgin Mary.[17] Therefore, in his discussion of the humanity of Christ, Joachim sought non-literal interpretations of Scripture as opposed to the citations he used during his discussion of the Trinity.

Finally, Joachim addressed the literal interpretation of Scripture among Jews and called for a deeper spiritual understanding. He quoted Daniel 9, 24 and discussed the seventy weeks of transgression before the Most Holy was anointed in the Holy City.

---

[15] Fiore 82. "*Sed hoc solum differt inter nomen verbi et nomen sapientie quod differe videtur inter nomen fluminis et nomen aque: siquidem aqua quelibet aqua est, et flumen nichilominus aqua est, sed in hoc tantum differt quod aqua potest dici et que fluit et que non fluit, fluvius autem non dicitur nisi sit aqua fluens*".

[16] Fiore 90. C.f. Romans 11, 23-27. "*...ac si una arbor oleastri et olive inserte in eo manu artificis et unione coniuncte*".

[17] Fiore 112. "*Verum ut hoc fieri posset, servata utriusque veritate nature, facta est velud quedam plantatio in utero sacre Virginis...*".

Joachim challenged the literal interpretation of this passage. Joachim argued that the Jewish Messiah had not appeared after the specified time and added that Jews were afraid to find themselves allied to the Antichrist.[18] Those who thought they were allied to Christ represented those who fell in Daniel 11, 14: "...there shall be many that stand up against the king of the South... but they shall fall". He doubted all the prophets because of the literal errors in Daniel and begged for a closer examination of the Old Testament.

Furthermore, Joachim stated that Jews could not spiritually understand what was spiritually written in the first place. This understanding could be granted only through conversion: "*quid mirum si non capitis spiritualia verba, qui necdun purificati fonte baptismatis Spiritum sanctum accepistis*?".[19] According to Joachim, it came as no surprise that those who never received the Holy Spirit through Christian baptism were incapable of understanding the spiritual meanings found in the text. Joachim quoted Isaiah 29, 14 "...for the wisdom of their [Jewish] wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid". Thus, Joachim believed that to remain a faithful Jew sealed one's doom, because spiritual understanding and salvation were only accessible through a conversion to Christianity.

After this explanation, Joachim criticized the significance of circumcision. He did not consider physical circumcision to be necessary for salvation; a spiritual circumcision was more important. To explain this further, he cited Deuteronomy 10, 16: "circumcise

---

[18] Fiore 120. "*Inde est quod, effectus cecus secundum maiorem sui partem, recepturus est Antichristum...*".
[19] Fiore 138. "*What is so astonishing if you do not understand spiritual words, you who have not been purified in the baptismal font and have not accepted the Holy Spirit*"?

therefore the foreskin of the heart, and be no more stiff-necked".[20] He claimed that God condemned their forefathers to wander the desert until the hearts of their children were circumcised. Thus, he claimed that if Jews were carnally circumcised, they were not spiritually circumcised. In fact, Joachim claimed that the old covenant was written in ink on animal skin on top of a stone table (referring to the hardness of their hearts); however, the new covenant was written on the living table of the heart with the spirit of the living God - a contrast in symbolism between life and death.[21] This was also a part of the theme of purification through Christian baptism, for which he cited Ezekiel 36, 25: "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean". This symbolized the invisible water of the Word of God which rejoined its element found in the sacramental water. In general, the spiritual sentiment of Scriptural exegesis could be summarized by Joachim's citation of 2Corinthians 3, 6: "...not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter kills, but the spirit gives life".

Joachim used prophetic language to warn Jews to convert to Christianity in order to obtain the spiritual knowledge needed for salvation. Given that Joachim thought that mankind was near the end of the third status, salvation at the end of the world would occur only if the Jews had converted. Thus, there was an obvious sense of urgency for the monk, especially after the Third Crusade. E.R. Daniel recounted a moment in Joachim's life when he thought that the armies of Antichrist would be unleashed upon the world. In 1195, Joachim met a friend in Messina who was recently in Alexandria where

---

[20] Fiore 152. "*Circumcidite preputium cordis vestrius...*".
[21] Fiore 154. "*...illud scriptum est in tabulis lapideis et pellibus mortuorum animalium, istud in tabulis cordis carnalibus non, ut dixi, atramento, sed spiritu Dei vivi*".

he heard that an alliance was to be concluded between heretics and Islamic forces. When the moment for the alliance came, Joachim believed that everyone would be privy to this knowledge. Among these evil forces were Turks, Moors, Ethiopians, and various northern enemies. Although they were allied to Satan, Joachim also believed that they were instruments of God because they would help bring about the Apocalypse.[22] Thus, Joachim's treatise against Jews became even more important.

Essentially, Joachim would arm himself with Scriptural understanding instead of a sword against infidels. However, he did not believe that all Jews would convert to Christianity; some of them, along with people from the branch of Gentiles, were reserved for the armies of Antichrist in the third status. If anyone, Jew or Christian, failed to believe in Christianity, they were to serve Gog, the leader of Antichrist's army. Therefore, not all Jews were supposed to be saved.

Recently, Robert E. Lerner has claimed otherwise. In his most recent monograph, Robert Lerner attempted to dispel the notion that all western Europeans in the high Middle Ages treated marginalized groups with contempt. He directed his argument against R.I. Moore's book *The Formation of a Persecuting Society (1987),* which claimed that western Europe turned into a "persecuting society" between the years 1100 and 1250.[23] This view, in his opinion, seems myopic, general, and untenable. He claimed that Moore's statement goes no farther than to make this strong assertion without regard to societal factors that influenced the progression of persecution in the high Middle Ages.

---

[22] West 310.
[23] Lerner, *The Feast* 1.

He made this claim despite the exhaustive studies conducted by Jewish scholars that substantiates Moore's argument with hard facts. According to Lerner, some well-known medieval figures did not support the persecution of marginalized people. His strongest claim to debunk this argument of a persecuting society was Joachim of Fiore's vision of history and its Jewish component. Joachim of Fiore was a monk who did not subscribe to persecution of Jews; in fact, he envisioned an era of mutual peace. While this is accurate, Lerner's attempts to argue for Joachim's "irenic" vision throughout the book seem somewhat strained; he did not account for Joachim's strong judgements levied against Judaism.

Lerner would have us believe that Joachim advocated parity.[24] As I have argued, his main treatise on the Jews suggested otherwise. Beyond the fact that Joachim believed that a certain number of Jews and Gentiles were condemned to follow the Antichrist, Jews simply had to convert to Christianity, which implied that they cease to be Jews by definition. Only those who did not "judaize" Scripture and who entertained a spiritual understanding of the final days would be saved - those are the people who 'bear fruit' at the end of time. If one were to believe that Joachim was an apocalyptically-minded monk who followed an Augustinian plan of soteriology, Jews had to convert to Christianity as a sign that the Apocalypse was at hand. Lerner did not mention whether Joachim believed in a final Jewish conversion to Christianity at first, despite Joachim's belief that the time for forgiving them, for their consolation, and for their conversion was at hand. After they converted, what would Jews retain of their "Jewishness"? Joachim addressed those Jews

---

[24] Lerner, *The Feast*, *passim*.

who were destined to convert and displayed more toleration for them because their conversion was a necessary step to Christian salvation.

Lerner never really stated whether Joachim's treatise was directed toward all Jews or only those who would eventually convert to Christianity .[25] However, Lerner implicitly leaned toward the latter. He confirmed this sentiment during his discussion of Gerardino of Borgo San Donnino and his exaggerated belief that Jews would remain faithful to Judaism until the very end. He mentioned this explicitly "…[He] surely never said that Jews would be saved who remain as Jews".[26] He failed to mention that Joachim's tone was reproachful; Joachim spoke to these latent Christians as a Jewish prophet from the Old Testament. Although Joachim did not advocate violent methods of forced conversion, the tone of his address was not exactly "irenic". Lerner also stated that Gerardino opposed the entrenched hatreds of his time more than Joachim. To whom were these hatreds directed? Does this imply that the high Middle Ages resembled the "persecuting society" of Moore's study?

Furthermore, Lerner tried to link this peaceful unification of Jews and Christians to the works of later Joachimists who espoused the abbot's beliefs. It is puzzling that Lerner chose Bonaventure in this context because this proponent of Scholasticism was quite critical of Judaism. This does not support his original argument; those who adopted Joachim's belief sometimes treated Jews with much more contempt, like Bonaventure. If anything, he offered evidence to confirm Moore's claims. Thomas H. Bestul

---

[25] Lerner, *The Feast* 42.
[26] Lerner, *The Feast* 47.

demonstrated how the devotional narratives of Bernard of Clairvaux, one of Joachim's mentors, and Bonaventure, Joachim's supposed champion of Jewish and Christian irenicism, depicted Jews as the cold-blooded killers of Christ.[27] There is nothing much in Bonaventure to support Lerner's claim.

In fact, in the next chapter of the book, which talks about Peter Olivi, Lerner's efforts to demonstrate the transmission of a peaceful view of Jews falls flat. Lerner readily admitted that there is not much known about Olivi's attitude toward Jews. There is no doubt that Olivi was a Spiritual Franciscan who familiarized himself with Joachim's works. This is the extent of our knowledge about Olivi's beliefs. Lerner was at pains to justify his inclusion of Olivi in this study. He was left to re-create, to the best of his ability and at the risk of overcontextualization, the probable living conditions of Jews in Olivi's native Narbonne in order to confirm Olivi's neutral stance. Although it is true that "nothing shows that Olivi had any burning hostility to Jews or any reason to be particularly concerned with them", there is little evidence that shows how he personally felt about them.[28] Lerner included the only shred of evidence about Olivi's beliefs about the role of the Jews at the end of time. He said that Olivi outlined the fate of the Jews: they were to be integrated into the Christian fold .[29] Perhaps the only way to describe Olivi's reduction of the Jewish people to a passive role in light of Joachim's treatise is that Joachim was fundamentally an apocalyptic monk. He realized that the key to the

---

[27] See Thomas H. Bestul, *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996).
[28] Lerner, *The Feast* 60.
[29] Lerner, *The Feast* 63.

Apocalypse was the conversion of the Jews, and if he could speed the process, he would. However, this does nothing to support Lerner's claim. This kind of scholarship contradicts the work of other academics studying the Middle Ages of western Europe.

Solomon Grayzel was a forerunner of this type of scholarship. In his analysis of thirteenth-century relations between Jews and the Church, Grayzel examined many of the papal Bulls and treatises of the high Middle Ages which urged the marginalization of Jews to the fringes of Western society. Grayzel was one of the first Jewish scholars to study this relationship.[30] One of Grayzel's most useful books, *The Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, provided detailed and invaluable information to scholars from the

---

[30] It is very difficult to argue against such a vast body of evidence in order to assert that anti-Judaism in the Middle Ages was a passing fad. Solomon Grayzel's study is only one example of the vast scholarship on this subject. There is an extensive corpus of material on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, and not all of it is written by Jewish scholars. Much of it depicts mendicants as instigators of violence and pogroms against Jews, as well as providing a general overview of the friction between Judaism and Christianity. For a brief synopsis of this relationship, especially as it concerns the Middle Ages, see Robert Anchel, *Les Juifs de France* (Paris: J.B. Janin, 1946); Bernard S. Bachrach, *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977); Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968); Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs* (Paris: Mouton and Co., 1963); Decima Douie, *The Conflict Between the Seculars and the Mendicants at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century* (London: Blackfriars, 1954); Andrew Colin Gow, *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995); Guido Kisch , *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status* 2nd. Ed. (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1970); Charlotte Klein, *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology* Trans. Edward Quinn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); Gavin Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1990), *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1990); Daniel Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1977); Abraham A. Neuman, *The Jews in Spain: Their Social, Political, and Cultural Life* 2 Vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America,1942); Heiko A. Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism* Trans. James I. Porter (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism* (New York: Atheneum, 1969); Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Etude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain, 135-425* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1964); Siegfried Stein, *Jewish-Christian Disputations in Thirteenth-Century Narbonne* (London: H.K. Lewis, 1969); Edward A. Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965); Joshua Trachtenberg , *The Devil and the Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943); Arthur Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935).

standpoint of a Jew who had exclusive access to the Vatican Secret Archive.[31] He made it possible for Jewish scholars to examine a corpus of papal manuscripts which were previously unavailable to non-Catholics. Essentially, Grayzel demonstrated that there was both an effort to protect Jews as well as a large movement which sought to persecute them because of their beliefs. Grayzel's basic claim was that since Jews did not consider Christ as their saviour, Christians made them heretics.[32] He recognized the fact that the major Christian authorities, such as St. Augustine of Hippo, assigned a prominent place to Jews in Christian soteriology. In *The City of God*, Augustine stated that Jews fulfilled a unique role; they were supposed to witness the salvation of all Christians at the end of time. Furthermore, they were to convert to Christianity before the Apocalypse; however, both Augustine and Gregory the Great thought that conversion by force was contrary to divine will.

Grayzel also pointed to the fact that a tolerance for Jews and Judaism was rooted in Roman Law.[33] Jews were theoretically allowed to live their lives in peace, though papal Bulls such as Calixtus II's *Sicut Judaeis* of 1123 seem to have been necessary to protect Jews against Christian persecutions. This suggested that Jews needed extra protection from Christians who were not willing to honour the doctrinal statements of Augustine and Gregory the Great. Although the pope thought it was necessary to protect the Jews, the Bull concluded " it applies only to such Jews as are not guilty of plotting to

---

[31] Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIII Century* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989) 14.
[32] Grayzel 3.
[33] Grayzel 4.

subvert the Christian faith".[34] Thus, it was left to the discretion of the local secular authorities to decide whether or not Jews were acting subversively toward Christianity. Grayzel demonstrated how Jews were persecuted on the basis of subversive beliefs, which were perceived as a threat to Christianity.

Grayzel also discussed the significance of the badge which Jews were forced to wear after the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 (the same Council that condemned the work of the Abbot), and the burning of the Talmud in Paris in 1242. In these instances, he argued that these events contradicted the spirit of the original Bull. By 1266, Pope Clement IV wrote to James I of Aragon, and insisted that James had given far too much leeway to Jews.[35] The Pope also warned James that it was well within Clement's right to decide what privileges all Jews should enjoy.[36] James' failure to obey him resulted in a second Bull, which was an invective against the Talmud. Clement claimed that it was blasphemous. Talmud against Testaments, Judaism versus Christianity; Jews were no longer merely a potential threat. Grayzel demonstrated how religious and secular authorities clashed in the administration of laws affecting 'subversive' Jews.

He also noted that the mendicant orders were created to combat heresies through preaching and example. He argued that the authority to search for heretics was taken out of the Bishop's hands and transferred to the monks.[37] In the thirteenth century, Urban IV and Clement IV gave more power to inquisitors in order to persecute heretics more

---

[34] Grayzel 5.
[35] Grayzel 10.
[36] Grayzel 10.
[37] Grayzel 13.

effectively; in the process, they abolished civil impediments along the way. For example, Grayzel stated that Clement IV issued a Bull called *Turbato Corde* against James I, which claimed that a number of bad Christians had abandoned the true faith, and "wickedly transferred themselves to the rites of the Jews".[38] James was ordered to use the secular arm if necessary to root them out. Thus, Grayzel established that there was a great body of papal Bulls which clearly showed that Jews were being persecuted by Christians, and popes believed Judaic beliefs threatened Christianity. R.I Moore's claim seems to have some grounding in facts, contrary to Lerner's opinion.

In general, Grayzel also demonstrated how the thirteenth century experienced an officially-sanctioned increase in clerical powers in order to combat heresy and to force secular powers to persecute sympathizers of Judaism. The role of the mendicant friars as the chief agents of this enterprise was indisputable. Despite the fact that conversion was supposed to be a voluntary and non-violent act, Clement's *Turbato Corde* clearly broke from this traditional ideal. Anti-Judaic sentiments spilled into secular life. Secular leaders were asked to assist the clergy to root out Judaism by the thirteenth century. A brief analysis of Jeremy Cohen's work will elaborate on the differences between Jewish scholarship on the treatment of medieval Jews and the sentiments of Robert Lerner.

Cohen supported Grayzel's views regarding the mendicant orders. In his book *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*, Cohen showed how the mendicant orders fanned the flames of Jew-hatred in the West. According to him, "mendicants engaged in a concerted effort to undermine the religious freedom and

---

[38] Grayzel 15.

physical security of the medieval Jewish community".[39] Following Grayzel's argument, Cohen concentrated on the power of the inquisitors, who were chosen from the mendicant orders. He traced the development of an anti-Judaic ideology, which began when Gregory IX condemned the Talmud in 1239. He claimed that mendicants of the thirteenth century left their monastic confines in order to rid Christendom of one of its greatest threats: Judaism. Both Grayzel and Cohen relied on papal records to insist that anti-Judaism was primarily a clerical phenomenon. Clement IV's harsh rhetoric in *Turbato Corde* seemed to bear this out. Grayzel has catalogued all the papal Bulls and documents against the Jews up to the fourteenth century.

Beyond these two accounts, Kenneth R. Stow's analysis of the medieval relationship between Christianity and Judaism suggested that Christian theologians were primarily concerned with the conversion of Jews. Stow concentrated on Jewish perspectives toward Christianity.[40] He pointed to three different perspectives among most scholars of anti-Judaism in the Middle Ages: those who regarded popes as protectors of Judaism; those who regarded popes as authorities who supported Jewish expulsions on account of the threat which Judaism posed to Christianity; and those who thought that popes were originally the foremost protectors of Judaism, but eventually became oppressive. It is easy to see how Christian scholars might fall into the first category and Jewish scholars like Grayzel and Cohen might fall into the second; however, Stow

---

[39] Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982) 13.
[40] Kenneth R. Stow, *The "1007 Anonymous" and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the High Middle Ages* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1984) 1.

claimed that he personally belonged to the third group of scholars. He showed how popes did not understand that protection was an effect alone and not an end in itself; popes were trying to define Jewry.[41] He claimed that in order to reconstruct this papal effort required a return to the sources, namely Augustine and Aquinas.[42] But when papal authority was unable to control attacks on Jews on behalf of Christianity, and canons delineating papal policy were not functional, the theological role of Jews as witnesses in the grand scheme of Christian soteriology fell apart. This is why those who "believed in Judaism" were persecuted - papal policies were not very effective, despite their positive intentions. Papal will buckled under secular pressure. However, like Cohen and Grayzel, Stow demonstrated that Christian authorities instigated attacks against Judaism; the only reason popes sought to protect them was to fulfill their eschatological role.

Yitzhak Baer cited a much older precedent for anti-Judaism, which he claimed began in the time of the Pharisees.[43] Baer examined the history of Jews and Judaism in Spain. His work was based on archival sources, and he attempted to reconstruct the role of Jews in western Christianity. He claimed that "the contest between Judaism and Christianity, which the Middle Ages inherited from ancient times, took on here more poignant form than anywhere else".[44] He claimed that this was a watershed for the oppression of Judaism. He believed that there was a long tradition of anti-Judaism which medieval Christianity inherited. Thus, according to Baer, there was continuity. Judaism

---

[41] Stow 1.
[42] Stow 2.
[43] Yitzhak Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971) 2.
[44] Baer 2.

assumed a subsidiary role to Christianity and Islam in medieval Spain. Baer claimed that anti-Judaism was the immediate result. Thus, Judaism was subject to the will of other faiths throughout history.

Bernhard Blumenkranz took a similar approach to anti-Judaism. He concentrated his attention on Jews and Christians who shared their lives in the same society despite their religious differences. However, Blumenkranz also said that Judaism was Christianity's counterpart as the two major proselytizing faiths in the period between 430 and 1096.[45] He claimed that this explained much about the anti-Jewish polemics written by churchmen at the time. However, Blumenkranz showed how Judaism and Christianity shared the same goals until the Crusades: missions, conversions, and the freedom to express their respective beliefs. In the twelfth century, Jews were perceived as the persecutors of Christ and a threat to Christianity.[46] He also discussed the depiction of Ecclesia and Synagoga in art at this time. Synagoga was usually represented as "*aveugle, les yeux bandés, sa lance brisée, les tables de la Loi glissant de ses mains, c'est un image de la misère, de la déchéance, de la défaite*".[47] This artistic depiction has also been studied by historians like Wolfgang S. Seiferth, who used similar sources. Like Baer, Blumenkranz also drew upon a more ancient precedent than Grayzel and Cohen, but Blumenkranz claimed that Christians attacked Jews indiscriminately after the Crusades.

---

[45] Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental: 430-1096* (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1960) 387.

[46] Blumenkranz, *Juifs* 388.

[47] Blumenkranz, *Juifs* 388. "*...blind, her eyes blindfolded, her lance broken, the tablets of the Law slipping from her hands, it is an image of misery, of decline, of defeat*". See also Wolfgang S. Seiferth, *Synagogue and Church in the Middle Ages: Two Symbols in Art and Literature*, trans. Lee Chadeayne and Paul Gottwald (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1970).

Therefore, there is a well-established tradition in the historiography of anti-Judaism which pointed to the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries as the hallmark of widespread attacks on Judaism. This tradition suggested that Christianity's anti-Judaic treatises played a part in the formulation of Jew-hatred which resulted in the oppression and persecution of medieval Jews. Orthodox Christian apologists have struggled with this reputation ever since.

It is apparent that the historiography of anti-Judaism emphasized the accountability of medieval Christianity as an agent in the persecution and oppression of Judaism. It seemed that all that was needed was a religious precedent. Judaism also represented a threat to Christianity for the conversion and salvation of souls. In this way, Christian massacres of medieval Jews, the marginalization of Jewish communities, the expulsion of Jews from several European regions, and the burning of the Talmud can be traced to religious exclusivism. As such, Christian orthodoxy has inherited a terrible legacy throughout the centuries. It is impossible to disassociate the mistreatment of Jews from Christianity. For all of Christianity's accomplishments in its remarkable past, the mistreatment of Judaism by historical figures who cited religious reasons to justify their actions has given Christianity a black eye from which it is still recovering. At the very least, the disparity between Jewish and Christian scholarship is prevalent in the historiography of the Middle Ages.

What is an historian supposed to do with Joachim's treatise? It was the work of a contemplative monk who was eagerly anticipating the third status and the peace of mankind, and if Jews had not yet converted, Joachim was prevented from doing his job

for God. Non-conversion would disprove his interpretations in their entirety. Thus, Joachim's thoughts were primarily apocalyptic and his attitude toward Jews was scornful. He condemned not so much a Jewish lifestyle as a Judaic hermeneutic; thus, the treatise was anti-Judaic. It must not be dismissed as a defence against Jewish attacks on Christianity, because as an apocalyptically-minded monk, Joachim believed that he stood at the edge of the Antichrist's abyss.

One should not underestimate the importance of the final judgement in the Middle Ages. The Apocalypse was as relevant to Joachim as it was to medieval Christians, if not more so. As I have mentioned, Joachim's perceived responsibility was to help save mankind by preaching extensively. In this respect, the Abbot was following the will of the Lord as a disciple. Eventually, Joachim's efforts would lead to the conversion of the Jews as a stage to the ultimate era of divine peace. It was a plan that was more powerful than any individual. Thus, without the conversion of the Jews as a necessary step toward eternal salvation, all of Joachim's prophecies would be erroneous. Furthermore, Joachim's biblical interpretation followed a certain order based on the concordance of the two Testaments. Just as the Trinity was comprised of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so the history of mankind was comprised of three ages. To err would be to deny the Trinity its divine power. The Apocalypse was everything for Joachim.

Similarly, Christianity emphasized the Apocalypse as the moment of Christian justification, salvation, and prominence, particularly in the Middle Ages. Revelations 20, 1-3 states that Satan would be bound for one-thousand years. Medieval Christians understood their world biblically and literally. The Apocalypse was ingrained in their

culture. Medieval Christians actively looked for signs to verify that the end of time was near. Plagues, storms, and strange natural phenomena were attributed to the coming of the Apocalypse. As Marjorie Reeves stated, a renewed interest in the meaning of history and mankind's prophetic destiny flourished in twelfth-century Europe.[48] The Trinity played a major role in the understanding of how the progression of mankind's history moved toward an age of spiritual harmony. Christ's return would mark an era of eternal peace for Christians. This event was the defining moment of Christianity and proved that Christians were among the chosen people of God. The conversion of Jews was a step toward that goal. It *must* occur, for it was ordained by God. To Joachim and to medieval Christians, the Apocalypse was an inevitability, not a possibility. It was the single most important factor in their spiritual lives.

Therefore, Joachim actively took the offensive against Jewish interpretations of Scripture. With the failure of the Third Crusade and Richard the Lionhearted's inability to slay the sixth head (Saladin) of the seven-headed dragon, preaching replaced military might as a way to convert pagans to Christianity. Given that this treatise was the prime catalyst toward Joachim's vision of the end of the world, historians' light treatment of the role of anti-Judaism in Joachim's thought-patterns is very peculiar.

---

[48] Reeves, *Prophetic* 2.

2. JOACHIM AND CHRISTIAN TRADITIONS

I have demonstrated Joachim's stern attitude toward the Jews and I have criticized Lerner's claims that Joachim had an irenic plan for all Jews at the end of time. One question still remains: if Joachim relied on the interpretations of his Christian forefathers, what was the attitude of the Church Fathers toward Jews, especially the exegetes whom Joachim venerated? This chapter will examine the various opinions of Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Hilary of Poitiers, Bernard of Clairvaux, Ambrose, and Chrysostomus as they pertain to Judaism in general. I hope to demonstrate the importance of Joachim's thought through my analysis, and I would like to stress common filiations of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism to gauge the Abbot's significance despite a well-established tradition of anti-Jewish literature.

To begin with, I turn to Augustine. In book 20 of *De Civitate Dei*, Augustine prophesied about the Apocalypse. It is important to establish a link between Joachim and Augustine, if only to demonstrate how closely the Abbot read the Church Father. Augustine warned against the habit of looking for signs of the final judgement: "For myself I am much astonished at the great presumption of those who venture such guesses".[1] Augustine was very candid about the groups of unbelievers who were destined to be led astray by the evil one: "But whatever the reason, those who are led astray by

---

[1] Augustine, *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972) 933. "*Sed multum mihi mira est haec opinantium tanta praesumptio*".

those signs and wonders will be those who deserve to be led astray".[2] It is clear that everyone would not be saved.

Furthermore, the book of Malachi revealed Augustine's disposition toward conversion. He accentuated the old Christian argument that Jews could not comprehend Scripture spiritually: a theme which Joachim fully embraced. Augustine claimed "...he foresaw that for a long time yet they would not interpret it spiritually, as they ought to have done".[3] However, something seen by Lerner as a Joachite innovation, namely, belief in the possibility of peaceful co-existence between Christians and Jews, is also found in Augustine. The North African believed that the Jews could be divided into fathers and sons; those who put Christ to death, and those who now live among Christians. Elijah would explain the law of the Jews so that they could understand it in a spiritual sense. Once the sons received the spirit of grace and mercy that came with conversion, they would repent. However, their parents would be condemned.[4] The sons must still grieve for their parents' crime. Once again, we see that not all Jews were to be converted and saved, nor should anyone look for signs.

Humanity would know when this would occur, because of the order of events leading to the final judgement: Elijah the Tishbite would come, Jews would accept the faith, Antichrist would persecute, Christ would judge, the dead would rise again, the good and the evil would be separated, the earth would be destroyed in the flames and

---

[2] Augustine 934. "*Sed propter quodlibet horum dictum sit, seducentur eis signis atque prodigiis, qui seduci merebuntur*".
[3] Augustine 957. "*quoniam praevidebat eos multo adhuc tempore non eam spiritualiter, sicut oportuerat, accepturos*".
[4] Augustine, *De Civitate Dei Libri XXII* vol. II (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1981) 483. "*...iam fideles non damnabuntur cum impiis parentibus suis*".

then would be renewed. He warned everyone that he considered that these events would occur in the order he had given. For this Abbot, who was eagerly anticipating the culmination of human history in the third status, Jewish conversion was a catalyst to final salvation. I believe that this is why Joachim adopted such a scornful tone in his address. Augustine gave one final warning about the final judgement: "All those events, we must believe, will come about; but in what way, and in what order they will come, actual experience will then teach us with a finality surpassing anything our human understanding is now capable of attaining".[5] In this regard, Joachim and his followers in particular were guilty of looking for the final signs of the end of the world - despite Augustine. In any case, Joachim's interpretations had much in common with Augustinian thought.

In his *Moralia*, Gregory the Great commented on the incredulity of the Jewish people. He revisited the metaphor of the Jewish heart resembling ice and frost because of their unbelief in Christ. However, Gregory was confident that most Jews would convert to Christianity before the end of time. He believed that the Holy Church would be given a reward for all of its hard work, and in the end, "she converts to herself the souls of the Jews likewise".[6] However, this spiritual knowledge would come to the Jews because of their jealousy: they would become jealous of what was right and would wish to strive for it. He also continued the popular Christian theme that depicted Jews as the chosen people

---

[5] Augustine, *Concerning* 963. "*Quae omnia quidem ventura esse, credendum est; sed quibus modis et quo ordine veniat, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quam nunc ad perfectum hominum intellegentia valet consequi*".

[6] Gregory the Great, *Morals on the Book of Job* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844) vol. 1, 30.

of God before they lost favour with the Almighty when they refused Christ.

Moreover, Gregory associated this event with the most evil of all vices, pride. Pride was the biggest obstacle to true spiritual understanding. It was an active process whereby they blocked their minds to the sacred words of preachers. He said "when they beheld his (Christ's) humility, being hardened with the haughtiness of pride, they laboured with the greatest care that the holy words of preachers should not enter their minds".[7] This was a serious allegation. Gregory believed that *Superbia*, otherwise referred to as the General of all vices, attacked the human body as the leader of the most serious sins known to mankind. The vices themselves acted like a disease which weakened the body. Pride begat all other vices and as such, it was the most dangerous of all sins. On the whole, Gregory also believed in a Judeo-Christian alliance at the end of time, much like Joachim and Augustine. Perhaps a reunification of Jew and Gentile at the end of time was not as unique a concept as Lerner has claimed.

Similarly, in Bernard of Clairvaux's *Sermons on the Song of Solomon*, the strong will of the Jewish people was reiterated. In sermon 14, Bernard claimed that the synagogues were stubborn, and the Jewish people put their trust in the law - a law that killed, because the written letter brought death to the unbeliever. He stated that the pride and envy of the Jewish people would leave them abandoned to their errors in judgement. However, he elaborated who will be saved: "He (God) will not cast them off forever, a remnant will be saved".[8] Some were still left to carouse with their friends, the demons,

---

[7] Gregory vol. 3b 603.
[8] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Life and Works of Saint Bernard*, eds. and trans., Dom John Mabillon and Samuel

outside the church; all the while despising the justice of God. It seems that Joachim's Cistercian exemplar did not share his "irenic" vision.

Ambrose discussed the Jews in his *Seven Exegetical Works*. He addressed the flowing fountain of Isaac and the wisdom which can be gleaned from it. Christianity filled its empty vessel to the brim to draw up the teachings of wisdom, whereas the Jews "did not wish to draw from the flowing fountain".[9] The parable of the unfruitful fig tree found in Luke 13 provides another metaphor with which to attack Judaism. The barren tree represents the wickedness of the Jews who did nothing with the knowledge offered to them. Once again, Ambrose taught that the Jews were offered divine wisdom, but they chose to turn away from it, whereas Christians embraced the true teachings of God: a trope which is reiterated in the parable of Jacob and the Happy Life. He compared Jews and Christians with a set of binaries which stressed the differences between them. For example, the "fat" and lazy Jews were compared to the "thin", active Christians; the soul of the Christian fed on virtue while the soul of the Jew fed on iniquity.[10] All the while, Ambrose claimed that the Jews did this of their own volition, thus passing into sacrilege by plan and intent. This contradicted the beliefs of Hilary of Poitiers, another one of Joachim's sources, who claimed that the Jews were simply ignorant and could not help themselves; but their salvation could be assured only if they chose to believe.[11] According to Ambrose, the awful but just consequence of 'Jewish idleness' seemed to be

---

J. Eales (London: John Hodges, 1896) 75. "*Sed nec repellet in finem, reliquas salvaturus*".

[9] Ambrose, *Seven Exegetical Works*, trans. Michael P. McHugh (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1972) 11.

[10] Ambrose 375.

[11] See Hilary of Poitiers, *Trinity* trans. Stephen McKenna (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954) 220.

servitude, as long as they had not yet decided to follow the expounder of learning in the spirit - a trope we have seen before.

However, there was still hope for the Jews. This theme was revisited frequently throughout his work. Ambrose was careful to state that even though the Jews killed Christ, denied the true faith, and fell from grace, "the Jews will be redeemed".[12] At this point, Ambrose almost foreshadowed the events leading to a truly Joachite version of the Apocalypse: "the Christian people will rejoice at this union, give aid to the limit of their resources, and send men to preach the good news of the kingdom of God, so that their call may come sooner".[13] Holy men (perhaps like Joachim) would preach the good news of salvation to make for a quicker conversion of the Jews. Perhaps this was a motivating factor in Joachim's doctrines that may have influenced his interpretation a union between Christians and Jews. The idea that Joachim was unique in envisioning a peaceful union between Jews and Gentiles now seems questionable.

Jerome reflected the same prejudice toward Jews as Ambrose and Hilary of Poitiers: that Jews were given a great gift from God, but did nothing with it. In the *Homilies on the Psalms*, Jerome stated that the sins of Jewish fathers would not result in punishment of the sons. Jews would certainly be saved according to Jerome, but he placed the salvation of Gentiles before that of the Jews. He quoted Romans 11, 25-26 to substantiate this belief: "when the full number of the Gentiles shall enter, then all Israel

---

[12] Ambrose 231.
[13] Ambrose 231.

shall be saved".[14]

However, Jerome was very specific as to the number of Jews selected to be converted, as one might expect from the translator of the Vulgate. He quoted Revelations 7 when he stated that only 144000 (12000 from each tribe) were reserved for conversion. He recommended that Christians say to the Jewish unbelievers of their time: "Your fate will be the same as that of the enemies of God".[15] After all, "all heretics are one with the Jews in blasphemies".[16] According to Jerome, the fundamental premise which united Jews was that they did not believe in the Trinity. He admonished all Christians who did not believe in the trinitarian doctrine and rather easily reduced all Jews to one belief. He stated "if, therefore, we speak of one God in a sense to exclude the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit from the mystery of the Trinity, we become Jews".[17] This is to say that Christians who were guilty of this disbelief were united with Jews *in nature*. All in all, he was a little more selective about the salvation and conversion of Jews in the final days.

Now that I have shown what Joachim has in common with his forefathers regarding Jewish conversion, it is time to show what Joachim's work is not: a piece of anti-Semitic literature. There is evidence which suggests that at times, Christianity was more anti-Semitic than anti-Judaic. This material would have been available to Joachim at the time of his exegetical work. Perhaps the most anti-Semitic Christian Doctor was John of Chrysostom, or Chrysostomus. His version of *Adversus Iudaeos* not only

---

[14] Jerome, *Homilies on the Psalms* vol. 1, trans. Sister Marie Liguori Ewald (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1964) 100.
[15] Jerome 100.
[16] Jerome 41.
[17] Jerome, *Homilies on the Psalms* vol. 2, trans. Sister Marie Liguori Ewald (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1964) 92-93.

addressed problems of the faith, but expressed a genuine disregard for Jews and how they lived their lives. Moreover, he attacked them as people as well as the believers of a particular faith. Judaism was an ailment to him which must be rooted out before Christians might be cured of this 'disease': "we must first cure our own and then be concerned for others who are strangers".[18] Chrysostomus was especially concerned with Christians who were converting to Judaism. He was worried about the numerous Jewish festivals which attracted more Christians to the Jewish faith.

In his quest to stem (what he presents as) the tide of Christians converting to Judaism and participating in Jewish festivals like Rosh Hashanah, Chrysostomus described himself as a physician - he hastened to anticipate this danger in order to prevent it from happening. In his opinion, this was truly a form of prescriptive medicine. He began his invective with the statement that Jews broke the yoke of Christ through their drunkenness and gluttony. He compared the Synagogue to a theatre which was filled with harlots dragged in from the streets. He often branded Jews as dogs, savages, and beasts: "they live for their bellies, they gape for the things of this world, their condition is no better than that of pigs or goats because of their wanton ways and excessive gluttony"; he even accused them of being worse than wolves.[19] He claimed that his primary interest was the cure of all Christian souls. To this end, he believed that Jews would not convert to Christianity in order to be saved, nor did he care to save them, unlike Joachim.

In fact, he believed that those who concealed Jews would share in their fate. In

---

[18] John Chrysostom, *Discourse Against Judaizing Christians* trans. Paul W. Harkins (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1979) 3.
[19] Chrysostom 14.

his opinion, what made this situation even more outrageous was that Jews had access to Scriptures and had their own prophets but did not turn to the true faith. Chrysostomus had no hope for the Jews and warned all good Christians to avoid them. He constantly referred to Jews as the damned 'other', going so far as to associate them with pagans and Satan: "does not greater harm come from this place (synagogue) since the Jews themselves are demons"?[20] Unlike the pagans, however, Jews had synagogues with invisible altars where they sacrificed the souls of men instead of sheep or calves. He constantly made commentaries on their lifestyles outside of their religious lives by accusing them of covetousness, plundering, abandonment of the poor, thievery, and cheating. They were winetippers, carousers, and brawlers. Finally, he charged them with outright infanticide "why must I mention teachers and prophets when they slaughtered their own children"?[21] He went as far as to suggest that Jewish mothers ate their own children![22]

Unlike Joachim and some of the Church Fathers I have discussed, Chrysostomus saw no possible union between these two people. He eventually asked his flock "why are you mixing what cannot be mixed"?[23] There was no sense of optimism. He believed that there was no possible way for the Jews of his day to reclaim the esteem enjoyed by their forefathers. He charged those who called themselves Christians to defend their faith against Jewish customs and a Jewish way of life. In fact, he held Christians who

---

[20] Chrysostom 23.
[21] Chrysostom 58.
[22] Chrysostom 118-119.
[23] Chrysostom 78.

converted to Judaism (Judaizers) in much more contempt than Jews, because these Christians were going along with lawbreakers and were able to stop the Jews, but were unwilling to do so. For this reason, Chrysostomus believed that they would all suffer the same fate. He derided their present prophets as hucksters and merchants. The tone of his invective, then, took on the guise of a sinister rescue. He said "let us go hunting for our brothers... even though they be unwilling, let us drag them into our houses...".[24] This was to safeguard against the allure of Jewish tents, the metaphorical representations of inns where "harlots and flute girls ply their trades".[25] It is obvious that his attacks were of a personal nature, *ad hominem*, and directed towards Jews as much as Judaism.

These examples are meant to emphasize the differences regarding interpretations of Jews throughout medieval Christianity. I have demonstrated that by and large, Joachim had pointed arguments to make about Judaism and its hermeneutic nature - it was summarily more literal and much less spiritual than Christianity. This argument is similar to many of the Church Fathers' arguments: namely, that Jews had the means of salvation in their hands and did nothing with it. They were referred to as the killers of Christ in these works. However, to a greater or lesser degree, Joachim's sources share an optimism about the future reunification of Jews and Christians. This is not a new sentiment, and Robert Lerner's claim to Joachim's uniqueness in this regard is somewhat dubious.

It is important to note that Joachim believed he was an active part of the

---

[24] Chrysostom 176. Cf. Augustine, "*compelle intrare*".
[25] Chrysostom 177.

alternative to eternal damnation. As such, he was willing to act on this belief and address the Jews to expeditiously convert those who were destined to convert. This was the prime motivating factor for the treatise, and as such, apocalyptic concerns were at the forefront, not a desire to follow the complex thoughts of traditional Christianity.

3. RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AND APOLOGETICS

> "...the anti-Judaism of the treatises has been largely ignored by the scholars who have examined them, many of whom were the great Catholic historians of spirituality of the twentieth century, who, no doubt, found the anti-Judaism an embarrassment when viewed against the backdrop of modern liberal ideals of religious toleration."[1]

In his study of medieval Passion narratives, Thomas H. Bestul described the difficulty modern audiences of the West have had in trying to understand anti-Judaism. In his opinion, this may explain why medieval anti-Judaic treatises have been neglected by some Catholic historians. This certainly was a bold statement. Bestul claimed that historians of anti-Semitism who have dealt with the life of the medieval Jews concentrated their studies on public acts and overtly polemical texts which were specifically directed toward Jewish communities. I find it necessary to question Bestul's claim; but as I have already demonstrated, there is great disparity in the scholarship that treats the historical role of medieval Jews.

This chapter will discuss the methods used by Christian scholars to claim Joachim for orthodox Christianity. I will discuss possible reasons why these academics neglect to engage the treatise on its own merits, and how they go about this. Despite the many derogatory interpretations of Joachim's work which linked him to charges of heresy throughout his life and after his death, despite Jewish scholarship, and despite his anticipation of a Jewish-Christian reunion, Christian scholars make a claim for Joachim's orthodoxy. I will offer some explanations as to why these scholars think it necessary to

---

[1] Bestul 69.

rescue Joachim from further scrutiny.

Perhaps another critical model of interpretation is needed. Dominick LaCapra's pointed argument against the ethics of historians as they attempt to account for the past is germane to McGinn's and Lerner's way of doing history. I shall not incorporate all of LaCapra's theories to thoroughly analyze McGinn's and Lerner's work. I will restrict my findings to the themes of transference, 'scapegoating', and cultural conditioning, because they are relevant to a particular bias. LaCapra argued that historians were very selective about the information they used in order to rationalize the past.[2] This interpretive bias was detectable in the presentation of history without regard for the rhetoric of historical figures (in this case, Joachim of Fiore and the Spiritual Franciscans), or that of fellow historians (Jewish scholars).

In fact, LaCapra argued that there is no self-critical mechanism within the discipline. As such, history is less like a craft and more like a "pampered profession" in which historians can state almost anything without fear of reprisal.[3] More importantly, LaCapra argued that historians were guilty of transference, whereby they try to make sense of past events and skew the interpretations in favour of some sources over others. The past is assimilated into the present and thus becomes a measure of a historian's cultural conditioning that requires that a "fully unified perspective" of the past be offered

---

[2] Dominick LaCapra, *History and Criticism* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1985) 71-72. LaCapra believes that as a discipline, History cannot converse with other disciplines like Philosophy and Anthropology.
[3] LaCapra 12.

so that audiences can understand it.[4] The aspects of the past that are unintelligible become problematic (like Joachim's treatise), so that the historian "scapegoats" these problems to make them seem "alien". They are neglected and not treated with the full attention they deserve. Perhaps this is why McGinn claimed that Joachim's treatise was written as a defense against Jewish attacks - the treatise is the single piece of the puzzle that does not fit his ideal paradigm.

In fact, those aspects which coincide with the historian's cultural conditioning entail a "total identification" with the past. In this case, this identification occurs with Joachim's orthodoxy and his innovative thoughts. Both of these anxieties are narcissistic in that they alleviate the anxieties of the historian's inability to control the object of study. Thus, by merely mentioning the treatise in passing, McGinn is free to "find order in seeming chaos... by providing a coherent, synoptic account of incoherent, fragmented phenomena".[5] This is simply poor scholarship, but it explains how and why Christian scholars attempt to control Joachim's thoughts and relevance to Christianity.

How do McGinn and other scholars transfer their beliefs onto the events of the past so as to present a coherent picture of Joachim's greatness as a Christian innovator? Abbot Joachim's smaller treatises escaped the critical eye of the major historians in the field, because they were not germane to their point. In fact, *Adversus Iudeos* received

---

[4] LaCapra 72-94. Lerner cannot account for Joachim's perception of the Jews other than as a transference of his values on to Joachim's interpretations. This is how Lerner identifies with *Adversus Iudeos*.
[5] LaCapra 83.

little more than a cursory glance. Historians such as Marjorie Reeves and Herbert Grundmann, pioneers and authorities in the field, were the first scholars to attribute the work to him. Other historians, such as Delno C. West, and perhaps the most renowned historian of apocalyptic spirituality, Bernard McGinn, acknowledged the treatise as Joachim's, with no regard to what the Abbot had to say about the fate of the Jews. The Jewish scholarship regarding medieval anti-Judaism represented by historians Jeremy Cohen and Solomon Grayzel demonstrated a marked difference in the treatment of sources. After a brief analysis of their methods, it is clear that West and McGinn were predisposed to the reconciliation of Joachim to the Latin Doctors and Fathers of the Church who created the orthodox Christian doctrines to which many still adhere; it is a claim fraught with difficulties, given that the Abbot's interpretations were linked to heresy.

Joachim's influence on spiritual thought lasted for centuries and has continued to fascinate historians like E.R. Daniel, who recognized the importance of Jews to Joachim. The Abbot thought that Saracenic power would reach its apex in the year 1200. Daniel mentioned that this crucial period would include a conversion of Jews and non-believing Gentiles as well as a reunification of the Greek with the Latin Church.[6] Daniel rightly emphasized Joachim's eagerness to convert Jews after the failure of the Third Crusade as the only alternative to military coercion. Thus, as Daniel stated, "apocalyptic rather than practical considerations moved the Abbot of Fiore".[7] Daniel was not concerned with

---

[6] West 453.
[7] West 313.

reconciling Joachim to orthodox Christianity, and openly acknowledged Joachim's anti-Judaic sentiments as apocalyptically-driven.

Historians like Delno C. West had a different agenda. Daniel and Reeves primarily wrote in the late sixties; they were preoccupied with properly attributing works to Joachim, as well as tracing the development of Joachimist thought throughout the West. They also proved the degree to which these spiritual thoughts survived into the nineteenth century. Morton W. Bloomfield and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, contemporaries of Daniel and Reeves, assisted in attributing many of the Joachimist works to specific authors who wrote after Joachim's death. As such, these historians claimed that the anti-Judaic treatise belonged to Joachim, but there was no close analysis of the work itself. Once the basic tenets of Joachim's thoughts were established, a different trend emerged. In the late seventies and early eighties, West and McGinn not only emphasized Joachim's complex thought, they also demonstrated how unique and profound his beliefs actually were.

In 1983, one year after Cohen's book was published, Delno C. West and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz published a book on Joachim's life, thought patterns, and influence. It was a study which re-examined the monk's main thoughts and his lasting imprint on Western culture. Granted, Joachim was no run-of-the-mill contemplative monk; his interpretations borrowed from the Latin Church Fathers to help organize his thoughts and justify his views. He consulted the sources most accessible to him, which was what any good monk would have done. However, as we have seen, his anti-Judaic treatise demonstrated both respect and contempt for Jewish interpretations. Here is West's only

mention of the treatise: "Joachim wished to prepare the Jews for their conversion".[8] He also stated that the purpose of the treatise was "to establish the basic tenets of Christian doctrine and to defend or to explain them".[9] To assume that Joachim took a defensive stance in his treatise is untenable; I have argued that he seemed to be on the offensive and was so out of necessity. If he were passive about Jewish conversions to Christianity, the Apocalypse could not occur. This was the work of a zealot whose goal was to realize a time of everlasting peace; why should he defend his beliefs if he is to be saved? If he thought that the Antichrist was already spreading evil on earth, then according to his beliefs, the Apocalypse was imminent. What would make West assume that Joachim was merely explaining or defending himself? It is clear that he did not examine the treatise, and according to the thrust of his argument, he did not feel a need to.

Furthermore, West's method of analysis was designed to reclaim Joachim of Fiore for orthodox Christianity. In the third chapter of the same book, West attempted to connect Joachim's profound thought to the Latin Church Fathers. Certainly, Joachim cited Jerome, Ambrose, and Gregory the Great; but according to West, Joachim's thought most closely resembled Augustine of Hippo's. Indeed, among all Church Fathers, the Abbot cited Augustine most often. For this reason, I shall analyze this source more thoroughly.

West correctly linked the Augustinian cosmic week to Joachim's history of mankind, for example. The Abbot used Augustine's disclaimer in *De Civitate Dei*: "...for

---

[8] West and Zimdars-Swartz 8.
[9] West and Zimdars-Swartz 94.

knowing the precise manner in which these things are carried out".[10] In other words, neither Augustine nor Joachim knew exactly when these events were supposed to happen. However, the similarities between Joachim and Augustine are not as profound as one is led to believe. Why would Joachim, a monk who supposedly considered Augustine to be the theologian *par excellence*, constantly look for signs of the Apocalypse? In fact, Augustine preached against this activity; he did not want Christians to look for these signs.[11] Leading a Christian life mattered most to Augustine. Joachim was actually searching for clues which foretold the inevitable end. He was anticipating the end of time when he connected the seven heads of the Antichrist to historical figures such as Herod, Nero, and Saladin. As we have seen, Joachim's belief in the Apocalypse was the main reason why he wrote his anti-Judaic treatise. His anti-Judaism had everything to do with his apocalypticism. Joachim's actions contradicted the instructions of Augustine.

Moreover, even though Joachim was connected to charges of heresy twice in his life, West skipped over these major incidents as though they were somehow trivial. He described the matter of the 1215 condemnation as follows: "although this controversy is mildly associated with his apocalyptic studies, the condemnation did tarnish his reputation to a degree".[12] West thought that it was more important that Joachim's eschatological interpretations were well-received by scholars in England, France, Italy, and Germany. Thus, he failed to put Joachim in his proper apocalyptic perspective; if

---

[10] West and Zimdars-Swartz 31.
[11] West and Zimdars-Swartz 30.
[12] West and Zimdars-Swartz 101.

Joachim's sole purpose as a spiritual man was to assist Jews to convert to Christianity so that the Apocalypse could occur more expeditiously, West had missed the point entirely. Why are the Abbot's views only mildly associated with his apocalyptic studies? In fact, West mentioned neither Joachim's previous Cistercian condemnation in 1192, nor the derogatory remarks which Geoffrey of Auxerre made. According to West, Joachim's relationship to the higher clergy was uniformly amicable. Aquinas did not agree with Joachim either, but there was no mention of this. Overall, one is left with a positive impression, free of conflict. In this light, it made sense that West considered the treatise a mere defense of Christianity; there was no regard to its anti-Judaic content.

West's final chapter in this book concluded with a commentary about the current state of affairs in Joachimist scholarship. A few points stand out. First, he supported the work of Bernard McGinn and shed light on McGinn's personal agenda, which seems to resemble his own. West claimed that "McGinn has been guided by a concern to represent classic statements on topics reflecting the interests of patristic and medieval apocalypticism".[13] The same can be said about West's perception. Efforts to rescue Joachim from the murky abyss of heresy in order to reclaim him for orthodox Christianity were now more explicit. West deemed this type of study appropriate; this topic was well-situated "to be located in the Christian apocalyptic tradition".[14] Furthermore, West believed that Joachim's relationship to the patristic writers would be

---

[13] West and Zimdars-Swartz 119.
[14] West and Zimdars-Swartz 120.

one of the most important areas of research to be undertaken in the next decade.[15] It is clear that West hoped to reconcile the Church Fathers with Joachim of Fiore. This link coincides with West's cultural conditioning. In fact, West ended his discussion by calling Joachim "a theologian of history"; reminiscent of the great theologians like Augustine, one of the greatest authorities in Christendom.[16] I will now turn my attention to the most prominent American Catholic medievalist of our times, Bernard McGinn.

There are few historians who have made as strong an impression on the study of medieval apocalypticism as this Professor at the University of Chicago. McGinn holds an endowed chair in the History of Christianity and Historical Theology at the Divinity School of the university. He received a Licentiate in Sacred Theology from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome in 1963. His Christian perspective on medieval apocalypticism is undeniable, but his scholarship has helped modern historians get a better grasp on medieval apocalyptic literature. His numerous articles and monographs have much to say about a Christian perspective on the end of time.

Certainly, one cannot censure Bernard McGinn for using the tools of his trade, at least, as he learned them. McGinn has been publishing his work since the sixties. His training takes after the 'great theologian model', in which scholars compared the interpretations of Scripture found in various Christian writings to the exegesis of the Church Fathers and Doctors. The writings of the latter group served as a template for Christian orthodoxy in an effort to gauge a Christian writer's proximity to standard

---

[15] West and Zimdars-Swartz 121.
[16] West and Zimdars-Swartz 121.

Christian thought. However, this kind of scholarly training is inherently biased toward a certain type of history: one that emphasizes the value of a work according to its resemblance to Christian orthodoxy. In this case, the pursuit to label Joachim an orthodox thinker, a monk whose writing is so difficult to label as either orthodox or heterodox, is a difficult task. McGinn does not account for Joachim's anti-Judaic demeanour, nor reconcile these anti-Judaic tendencies with those of the Church Fathers.

One of his most renowned monographs is a compilation of selected primary texts which addresses apocalyptic themes. *Visions of the End* was originally published in 1979, just prior to West's book about Joachim. In chapter seventeen, McGinn gave a brief introduction to Joachim, whom he considered to be not only the most important apocalyptic author of the Middle Ages, but one of the most significant theorists of history in the Western tradition.[17] According to McGinn, Joachim was a figure of "international repute" after 1184; yet one might well ask whether Joachim's contemporaries throughout the world, such as Chu Hsi, Eisai, or Muhammed of Ghur knew anything about the Abbot from the village of Celico in Calabria.[18] McGinn also claimed that Joachim served as an "apocalyptic advisor to the peace party in the Roman curia", further emphasizing a seamlessly civil relationship with the higher clergy.[19] In general, McGinn painted an accurate but somewhat exaggerated picture of the Abbot. He offered no information about the anti-Judaic treatise in his brief introduction.

In 1975, Delno C. West edited a compilation of essays about Joachim. The

---

[17] West and Zimdars-Swartz 126.
[18] West and Zimdars-Swartz 126.
[19] West and Zimdars-Swartz 126.

second volume included an article written by Bernard McGinn, which was first published in 1971.[20] It purported to discuss the Scholastic reaction to Joachim of Fiore's eschatology. He began with a quote from Pope Boniface VIII which was uttered after he read a Joachite treatise: "why are these fools awaiting the end of the world"?[21] - a typical Augustinian attitude. McGinn claimed that this must have been the reaction of many of the thirteenth-century popes. Perhaps McGinn might have presented this quote more appropriately if he addressed it in the first person singular. He found no fault with Joachim's condemned views of the Trinity. In fact, he claimed that Joachim's thought was a reaction to the Scholastic application of logical categories and distinctions to theology; McGinn even associated this reaction to Bernard of Clairvaux's similar reaction to Scholastic thought in his work *De Consideratione.*[22] It is worth remembering that Joachim's work was condemned, unlike St. Bernard's. This is not a fair comparison, and to implicitly suggest that Joachim is more closely bound to orthodox Christianity because of his connection to Bernard of Clairvaux is a fallacy. How is it that the same reaction to Scholastic thought makes a saint of one monk and a heretic of another? McGinn also said that Joachim was a "traditionalist speaking out against new theological trends from a not very well informed position".[23] Apparently, Joachim misunderstood Lombard's trinitarian views. However, calling him a traditionalist implied that Joachim was part of a longer Christian tradition; then why was he condemned? Was this just a big misunderstanding?

---

[20] The title of this article is "The Abbot and the Doctors: Scholastic Reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore".
[21] West 453.
[22] West 455.
[23] West 455.

The fact remains that he digressed from the norm of Christian orthodoxy. It seems that McGinn was trying very hard to portray Joachim as an orthodox Christian thinker.

Furthermore, McGinn did not take any specific stand for or against Joachim's heresy. This is his LaCaprian scapegoat. He preferred to call Joachim's views radical, not heretical; he paid no attention to the condemnation, and defined Joachim's radical nature as "spiritual thought which would effect drastic changes in the mode of institutional operation".[24] Can the same not be said about Lollards and Waldensians? In fact, McGinn was undecided as to the heretical nature of the monk. He stated: "whether radical may also mean heretical or not, I will leave to the judgement of those who are able to educe a-temporal definitions of orthodoxy".[25] He was playing it safe; he did not want to commit himself to anything.

To be fair, Marjorie Reeves proved that the *Damnamus* condemnation of 1215 was carefully worded so as to avoid any direct attack on the monk. However, as Reeves rightly deduced, "none the less, to theologians of succeeding generations, this condemnation placed Joachim in a definite category of one who had erred in his theological doctrine".[26] That is to say, the line between the condemnation of a monk's writings as opposed to the man himself is a fine one indeed. In fact, Aquinas forbade any reading of Joachim's work, which he thought was erroneous and suspect.[27]

No hint of Joachim's anti-Judaic sentiments is found in McGinn's great

---

[24] West 457.
[25] West 457.
[26] Reeves, *Influence* 33.
[27] West 458.

monograph about the monk, *The Calabrian Abbot*, published in 1985. McGinn's method was as simple as it was effective: his use of disclaimers placed him squarely on the fence. The discourse was one which did not confront Christian theological discrepancies directly, nor did it engage the wealth of Jewish scholarship mentioned previously. By adopting this position, he avoided criticism. The bulk of these disclaimers appeared in his first chapter. He admitted that his study was not a complete survey of Joachim: "many aspects of his life, *writings* [my italics], and influence are not treated, or at best hinted at".[28] This brief statement glossed over all of Joachim's strong anti-Judaic writing. McGinn also recognized the pitfalls of this approach: "my conclusions will doubtless be questioned by other scholars, for there can be no final interpretation of major thinkers, of whom Joachim is certainly one".[29] His stated purpose was to interpret the man and his meaning for the history of Western thought. However, it soon becomes apparent that what McGinn did not say was as important as what he did say.

This is not to imply that McGinn is a bad scholar. He worked well with the primary source documents which he chose to study, especially the Latin texts. His analysis, however, was designed to emphasize Joachim's importance to Christian doctrine. McGinn dwelled on Joachim's trinitarian view of history and his use of symbols and images, like most other historians in the field. But more importantly, he ended his book with the same article which compared Joachim to the Doctors of the Church. In his conclusion, McGinn sensed a renewed perception of the importance of Joachim's role in

---

[28] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 2.
[29] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 2.

the history of Christian theology.[30] In order to appreciate his genius, according to McGinn, Joachim must be compared to his forebears. However, Joachim's genius was also apparent in his apocalypticism and his innovative thoughts, not as an epigone of Jerome or Augustine. As I have outlined in the previous chapter, Joachim displayed neither the anti-Semitic sentiments found in Chrysostomus, nor the apocalyptic pessimism of the Church Fathers. For these reasons, he is an innovator. However, if one were to reconcile a major thinker to the Christian authorities of the past, comparisons to the Latin Church Fathers must be made. In fact, McGinn finally came right out to say what he had tried to do all along: he considered Joachim a major Christian thinker.[31] Was it Joachim's intention to be regarded as such? I submit that the monk was too concerned with the end of time and his own role in it to worry about his reputation as a great Christian thinker. In fact, Joachim never considered himself a prophet, even though he had a brief reputation as one.[32] However, McGinn associated the Abbot with elite Christian company by saying "the Calabrian Abbot might be described as a Janus-figure [forward and backward looking] among the major Christian theologians of history".[33] This statement is too contentious and too general to be of any use.

If history has shown us anything, it is that no Church Father or Doctor has flirted as much with outright condemnation for heresy as Joachim did. If anything, McGinn demonstrated precisely how Joachim could not fit this orthodox paradigm. Joachim's use

---

[30] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 235.
[31] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 235.
[32] Reeves, *Prophetic* 24.
[33] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 236.

of a cosmic week to account for mankind's theological progression throughout history since the fall of Adam suggests similarity, not parity. As previously mentioned, Joachim consistently looked for signs of the end of the world, despite Augustine's warnings. He interpreted the Saracenic invasion of Jerusalem as a sign; Richard I would slay the head of the beast of the Apocalypse (Saladin) in the Third Crusade; and perhaps most importantly, Joachim thought that the conversion of the Jews was necessary for the fulfillment of the Apocalypse itself. A prominent following of Franciscans developed after his death. They fixed certain dates to the beginning of the end - like 1260, for example. This hardly represents the credentials of one of the greatest Christian theologians in history, at least not in the orthodox sense!

I propose to appreciate Joachim's unique exegesis on the basis of its apocalypticism. In so doing, it is imperative that scholars study his minor treatises, such as *Adversus Iudeos.* Given its central importance as an intended catalyst of the Apocalypse, this minor work has major implications. Thus, Joachim's anti-Judaic sentiments must be re-examined in order to make sense of his exegesis. Why must scholars claim him for orthodoxy or any other particular category? Even though McGinn's study heralds Joachim as one of the greatest Christian theologians, his book has been accepted as a standard in the field of Joachimism by major historians like Robert E. Lerner.[34] Therefore, Thomas H. Bestul's comment is a bold but valid criticism of historians like McGinn.

It is amazing how such an obvious body of evidence, in this case, Joachim's anti-

---

[34] Robert E. Lerner, rev. of *The Calabrian Abbot* by Bernard McGinn, *Speculum* Oct. 1986: 965-968.

Judaic sentiments, can be summarily ignored. Whether McGinn is truly embarrassed as Bestul suggests cannot be known with any degree of certainty. It would be interesting to see how Grayzel or Cohen would treat Joachim's treatise as a serious subject. If McGinn were to closely examine the treatise, it would be more difficult to make his claims for orthodoxy; lest we forget McGinn's background and place of employment. This is how McGinn's silence on the subject betrays him. To ignore this aspect of Joachim's thought is to misinterpret his apocalyptic nature.

Despite this historiography, how does a historian rescue an innovative thinker like Joachim of Fiore from negative stereotypes of heresy and hatred of Jews without transferring the unwanted stain of anti-Judaism onto the palimpsest of orthodox Christianity? Bernard McGinn's method is well-organized and thoroughly complex. In order to tap into Joachim's greatness on behalf of Christianity, McGinn started with an explanation of orthodox exegesis about eschatology. It is no surprise that he devoted an entire chapter to the development of Christian theologies of history. Why must Joachim's exegesis be compared to orthodox paradigms of spiritual thought? McGinn briefly accounted for Christianity's inheritance of Jewish eschatological views, although he claimed that it was difficult to pinpoint which particular Judaic beliefs find their way into Christian orthodoxy.[35] He claimed that Jewish apocalyptic sources were all deterministic, and God had pre-ordained all things to come; thus, history was totally pre-determined.

This was the only time that McGinn talked about Joachim's tendency to look for signs of the end of time; it seems to fit a Jewish apocalyptic analysis, not a patristic

---

[35] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 52.

one. He claimed that in the linear progression of history, one needed to "search for the signs of the times as indications of where the present stands in relation to God's great scheme".[36] By insisting that patristic apocalypticism owed its inspiration to a longer Jewish apocalyptic tradition, McGinn allowed Joachim the freedom to look for signs of the end, despite Book XX of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* which stated that how or in what order events occur that lead to the end of time, nobody knew. Therefore, the claim that the Christian patristic authors depended on a more ancient Jewish apocalyptic tradition helps Joachim leap over Book XX in the Christianity's teleological progression toward the end of time. How did the Church Fathers draw upon this tradition so that we can establish some sort of congruency? McGinn claimed that Jewish views came into Christianity through Origen and Eusebius of Caeserea, until we reach Augustine of Hippo. Once McGinn used Augustine's works as a meta-narrative of Christian apocalypticism, he established Joachim's orthodox credibility. Therefore, there are two distinct and possibly contradictory influences at work in this tradition of spiritual apocalypticism: Judaic and patristic. McGinn used both of them to explain Joachim's actions, and to present the (falsely) fully unified perspective discussed in LaCapra's book.

It is apparent that McGinn saw a linear progression of spiritual and apocalyptic thought which began with ancient Judaism and extended through the patristic era until it reached Joachim of Fiore and the Scholastic thinkers. Thus, Joachim drew from a much longer and more well-established tradition than one might have thought, according to McGinn. To credit Joachim is to honour the Church Fathers; to brand him a heretic

---

[36] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 52.

forces one to question the validity of McGinn's claim that Joachim is associated with orthodox Christianity. This becomes even more significant if we consider the historiography on anti-Judaism I have outlined. If we establish Joachim's anti-Judaic nature, must Christian orthodoxy assume responsibility for what happened to Jews throughout the Middle Ages? If one were to agree with the claim that Joachim was an orthodox thinker, any association with anti-Judaism might damage the credibility of orthodoxy. To avoid this altogether, McGinn minimalized discussion about the anti-Judaic treatise, and tied Joachim to a greater Jewish apocalyptic tradition. By proxy, he is innocent by association. Therefore, to say that these anti-Judaic views belonged to an apocalyptic tradition from which Christian orthodoxy borrows redirects Joachim's anti-Judaic overtones back to the tradition. Christianity is no longer associated with the atrocities committed against the Jews on behalf of religion. This is what McGinn tried to accomplish in his first chapter.

In an effort to discuss the Jewish apocalyptic heritage and its relationship to Christianity, William Adler's criticism of P. Vielhauer's interpretation of apocalypticism also emphasized McGinn's biases about Jewish apocalypse traditions.[37] Adler pointed to the general belief that primitive Christianity and Jewish apocalyptic literature had much in common. However, despite certain affinities, he claimed that Christian apocalypses were "heirs to the form but not the 'thought-world' of their Jewish prototypes".[38] He claimed that the two religions were not homogenous and the boundaries between them

---

[37] James C. Vanderkam and William Adler, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996).
[38] Vanderkam and Adler 2.

were "fluid and uncertain for a long time".[39] If anything, the Christian apocalypse was part of a general *zeitgeist*, or an epiphenomenon.

In any case, scholars like McGinn and Vielhauer point to a linear progression of ideas. Vielhauer believed that Jewish apocalypses formed the background literature to Christian apocalypses as seen from the perspective of the New Testament. He found enough similarities to create a common literary genre. McGinn also stated that the two apocalyptic traditions had common *topoi*, but differed in their interest in history. Jewish apocalypses relied more on history, whereas Christian apocalypses did not, except in the "greatest and most influential of them, the Apocalypse of John".[40] In fact, he claimed that the Christian fascination about the meaning of history "grew out of intertestamental Jewish apocalyptic eschatology".[41] It was a linear progression in every sense. Since Joachim's exegesis focused primarily on Revelations, he was one of the Christian historical figures who perpetuated the Jewish apocalyptic tradition. Just as Vielhauer's interpretation of a static Jewish apocalyptic heritage formed an ideal backdrop against which to explain Jesus' transcendence of the apocalyptic environment, so McGinn's fixed picture of historical Jewish apocalypses was germane to the creation of the Apocalypse of John; in turn, the Apocalypse of John was one of the most frequently used biblical texts of medieval Christian thinkers. Thus, it is more difficult to believe that someone who took such a big part in the growth of a Jewish apocalyptic tradition could deride the creators and followers of that same tradition! More importantly, this dubious link

---

[39] Vanderkam and Adler 27.
[40] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 75.
[41] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 51.

between Joachim and Jewish apocalyptic traditions reaffirms the LaCaprian critique of trying to make sense of an incoherent past in order to present a unified perspective of history.

If Joachim is merely a cog in this great tradition, how does McGinn deal with the anti-Judaic treatise? How does he deflect attention away from Joachim's anti-Judaic leanings and refocus it on a more palatable discussion of Judaism? McGinn began his study of Joachim with a historical contextualization: the man in his milieu. During this lengthy analysis, he gave a passing nod to the content of the treatise: "the piece is an interesting contribution to the anti-Jewish polemics that had proliferated for a century or more, especially because the abbot had much greater hopes for the Jews than most of his contemporaries".[42] He cited no evidence for either claim. Thus, McGinn also pointed to a larger tradition of anti-Jewish polemics; what I would call anti-Judaic treatises. Does this somehow diminish the fact that Joachim strongly attacks Judaic beliefs in an effort to convert Jews to Christianity? According to McGinn, it was not an attack, but a defense. He said "the treatise was written... to answer Jewish attacks on Christian beliefs, as were most of the works against Jews..."[43] Once again, McGinn linked the treatise to a larger tradition that defended itself from an attack on Christian beliefs; this line of reasoning is completely opposed the historiography on anti-Judaism.

Now that McGinn has made Joachim a passive protector of Christianity and part of an ancient Jewish apocalyptic tradition on the long linear timeline of apocalyptic

---

[42] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 35.
[43] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 35.

spirituality, he tries to reconcile Joachim with the meta-narrative of Augustine of Hippo's *De Civitate Dei*. According to McGinn, Augustine was Joachim's favourite theologian, because the Abbot cited his work most frequently among the Church Fathers. In other words, McGinn tried to establish Augustine's authenticity as the most influential Church Father and the most authoritative orthodox figure, so that he could associate Joachim with him. He began with the statement that the most profound theology of history was created by Augustine.[44] McGinn also claimed that Augustine considered the apocalyptic mentality that tried to predict the approach of the end the worst of all errors. For this, McGinn quoted Acts 1, 7 and Matthew 24, 36: "it is not for you to know times or dates that the Father has decided by his own authority". However, he did not mention that Joachim frequently broke this rule. He had already tied the search for signs of the end to the Jewish tradition.

McGinn also linked the exegesis of the Apocalypse of Latin Christianity to the more ancient Judaic precedent: "the Apocalypse of John belongs to a genre of literature that was one of the most potent creations of inter-testamental Judaism".[45] He claimed that the Apocalypse of John showed as much interest in history as its Jewish counterpart. At every turn, McGinn emphasized that Christian apocalyptic thought was inherited from Judaism. Therefore, to argue against the Christian tradition was to argue against the Jewish tradition. He concluded that after Augustine and Jerome, chiliasm and the literal reading of the Apocalypse were increasingly outmoded theological options for the

---

[44] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 62.
[45] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 74.

Church; it now favoured a spiritual interpretation.[46] He claimed that for the next seven hundred years until Joachim's exegesis in the twelfth century, this was the preferred way to read Scripture. Therefore, he suggested that there was continuity of spiritual thought from the fifth to the twelfth centuries. However, he conceded that Bede, Alcuin, Beatus of Liebana and Adso of Montier-en-Der added some interesting interpretations on their own. Before McGinn could analyze Joachim's spiritual understanding of the Apocalypse, he had to associate it with a larger framework of Christian thought which was typified by Augustine. Thus, Joachim was influenced by Augustine, the theologian par excellence, who formulated his ideas from Jewish apocalyptic sources. However, if Joachim was truly an orthodox thinker, McGinn must also reconcile him with the Scholastics.

After an analysis of Joachim's main thoughts, Bernard McGinn makes his final claims for Christian orthodoxy. He had already morally separated Joachim from his anti-Judaic nature by linking him to a larger Jewish tradition of apocalypticism, and he showed that Joachim was more positive toward Jews and Judaism than other contemporary Christian writers. McGinn established Augustine's primacy in Christian thought as the chief authority on the Apocalypse, and he maintained that Joachim relied heavily on Augustine's work. By this point, he has upset the historiographic applecart: he said that Joachim was merely defending Christian beliefs in his anti-Judaic treatise. McGinn is left with two tasks: to link Joachim with the Church Doctors who exist further down the linear timeline than the Abbot, and to openly state that Joachim is an orthodox thinker. He accomplished his first goal when he associated Joachim and the Doctors with

---

[46] McGinn,*Calabrian Abbot* 75.

apocalyptic thought; this tradition of the Scriptural interpretation of the end of time was the agent McGinn needed. The problem that he faced was the condemnation of 1215, which denounced Joachim's views about the Trinity. If Joachim was a heretic, all of McGinn's logic unravels, and Joachim is left in the mire of religious fanaticism. How did he get around this obstacle? McGinn acknowledged the condemnation, but he regards it as one phase in the history of Joachimist thought. McGinn was more interested in the "relationship between apocalypticism and Scholasticism".[47] In this way, McGinn was able to reconnect Joachim to the Christian mainstream of apocalyptic traditions, even though he denied that Joachim was concerned to convert Jews - an act steeped in apocalypticism.

Thus, McGinn connected all of the dots along the timeline of apocalyptic spirituality, with brief stops at Augustine, Joachim, Aquinas, and Bonaventure. The last dot in the great tradition is found in the late twentieth century. According to McGinn, the central theme has always been "yearnings for a more universal and a more direct understanding of history".[48] Through this continuum, McGinn was able to filter out any anomalies of spiritual thought, such as the Abbot's anti-Judaic attitudes. Joachim looked for signs of the end, but this was what Jewish apocalyptic exegetes did, despite the Christian Fathers. This method of analysis also allowed him to make strong connections to traditional orthodox thinkers like Augustine. The reference to Augustine's meta-narrative fell back on the long linear tradition of apocalyptic thought; Joachim's

---

[47] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 207.
[48] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 224.

spirituality can be Jewish and Christian at the same time. Essentially, McGinn allowed himself the freedom to pick and choose several facts which disassociated Joachim with anti-Judaism, so as to link him to Augustine, Jewish traditions, Aquinas, and Bonaventure (and even some of us)! As a result, he is finally able to make his claim: "Abbot Joachim is a major Christian thinker".[49]

As I have argued, Robert Lerner put a positive spin on his discussion of Joachim by claiming his unique irenic vision of a Judeo-Christian alliance was truly innovative. In fact, Lerner over-extended his argument by trying to demonstrate how this vision of a joint peace was shared by Joachim's followers, the Spiritual Franciscans, who were not orthodox Christian thinkers. I have shown how this sentiment of a joint peace was shared by many of Joachim's Christian sources. There is very little evidence to claim that the Spiritual Franciscans shared this ideal vision of irenicism in the third status. His conclusions, like those of West and McGinn, are untenable.

---

[49] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 235.

4. ESTABLISHING JOACHIM'S HISTORICAL VALUE

I have demonstrated how Joachim has been perceived as one of the most important Christian thinkers; now, I would like to discuss what I believe to be Joachim's most salient attributes as a major historical figure, and some of the most serious accusations levied against him and his work. Any serious study of Joachimism requires an analysis of the Abbot's life, his main doctrines, and the theological innovations which make him a predominant apocalyptic figure in the high Middle Ages. If his influence is as widespread as many scholars claim, it is imperative to understand what Joachim thought about the final days of humanity on earth. If Joachim's originality can be established as a template for his somewhat radical thoughts by the standards of his day, only then can his views on Judaism be put into perspective. Historians of Christianity have been quick to proclaim that Joachim is one of the greatest thinkers of all time. This chapter will focus on Joachim's main thoughts about the Apocalypse in an effort to gauge his Christian orthodoxy and offer a basis for comparison to the theological standards of some of the more renowned Christian thinkers before and during the thirteenth century. I will also demonstrate what makes Joachim of Fiore such a prized commodity in academia, and why he had such influence throughout the Middle Ages. What is known about him?

Joachim of Corazzo, born the son of a notary by the name of Maurus in Celico in southern Italy in 1135, did not pursue his eventual vocation early in his life. In fact, very little is known about Joachim's childhood; only records of his adulthood exist. He was

originally trained for a career in administration in nearby Cosenza. Working as a functionary in Palermo's royal chancery, he was exposed to a secular life far removed from his eventual calling. During a visit to the Holy Land at the age of thirty-two, Joachim finally found his vocation. This was the site of Joachim's first spiritual revelation. Upon his return to Sicily, he led an ascetic life near Mount Etna where he lived in a Greek monastery. Joachim thought that the contemplative life of a monk was the mark of perfection.[1]

His ordination as a priest was prefaced by a life of asceticism without any formal ties to the Benedictine Order near Corazzo. By 1176, Joachim became the Benedictine monastery's Abbot. As Robert Lerner states, Joachim's primary concern as the Abbot of this monastery was "to accomplish the incorporation of his monastery into the Cistercian Order, the most dynamic monastic congregation of the day".[2] This could only be accomplished if the Abbot traveled to Casamari to be sponsored by the Cistercian monastery just south of Rome. This was when Joachim began to explore his theories about the Apocalypse. There is evidence that Joachim completed two works during his stay in Casamari: a commentary on the Apocalypse and an exposition of concordances between the two Testaments.

During his stay at Casamari, Joachim experienced an epiphany about the book of Revelation. On Easter, 1184, the concordances of the two Testaments and the meaning of the book of Revelation became lucid in the Abbot's mind. Joachim began to formulate

---

[1] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 6.

[2] Lerner, *The Feast* 9. Lerner cites the scholarship of Stephen Wessley in his claims that Joachim was fully engaged in prophecy based on biblical knowledge; he began to use the Bible as a roadmap to salvation.

his views on the Trinity at this time, a vision which came to him in the form of a chant from a psaltery and thus the impetus behind the *Psalterium Decem Chordarum*, around Pentecost of the same year. He was also granted a license by Lucius III to complete work on some of his prophecies - a work which Joachim eventually finished after he returned to his monastery in Corazzo late in 1184.

He actively gained support and approval of the most influential figures in Sicily at that time, including Henry VI and his wife, pope Celestine III, Frederick II, and Richard the Lionhearted.[3] The Abbot built a strong reputation with this powerful group of people. This reputation allowed Joachim the opportunity to meet with apocalyptic historical figures like Richard the Lionhearted at Messina in 1191 on the way to the Third Crusade. Joachim obviously believed that this was a key component to the realization of the Apocalypse. However, Roger of Hoveden's account recorded a dispute between Joachim and "other ecclesiastical men of great learning in the Holy Scriptures" who attempted to prove Joachim's interpretation of Antichrist wrong. The dispute ended in a stalemate.[4] Therefore, Joachim's interpretations were somewhat contentious; he did not subscribe to conventional interpretations of the Apocalypse, or of Antichrist in any case.

Not everyone was receptive to the Abbot and his prophecies. Joachim suffered at the hands of detractors throughout western Europe. Geoffrey of Auxerre was one of the most vitriolic and defamatory critics of the *magnus propheta*. He vehemently condemned

---

[3] See Delno C. West and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz, *Joachim of Fiore* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1983).
[4] Roger de Hoveden 180.

Joachim for his views on the Apocalypse. Joachim and his friend Rainier were condemned by the General Chapter of the Cistercian Order. In September of 1192, Geoffrey of Auxerre, the secretary of Bernard of Clairvaux, personally attacked Joachim and claimed that he was a false prophet of Jewish descent - a claim that had very little evidence to support it.[5]

Despite these conflicts, Joachim continued to meet with powerful people in Europe. In 1194, he met with Henry VI to receive a generous grant toward a new monastery. He also received support from the papacy. Joachim's position against the Cistercian Order was regularized by pope Celestine III in 1196. Celestine issued a bull on August 25 which officially recognized the new Order of Fiore. Joachim had successfully established his own Order, which had several houses amid the mountains. Toward the end of his life, he concentrated on completing his writing, especially his three major works.

Joachim's influence is a direct result of the innovation in his biblical exegesis, especially from the book of Revelation. One of the most important innovations for my purposes is Joachim's concordances between the two Testaments. This double-sided mirror of history ties one Testament to the other to account for the entire history of mankind. Joachim believed that the Old Testament was the only resource available for Jews and a template for a way of life in the ancient world. However, it was relevant to the ecclesiastical Church of his day. Robert Lerner claimed that there was always a link

---

[5] See McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 44, n. 95.

between the 'head' and the 'body' in Joachim's hermeneutics.[6] This means that whatever one derived as an interpretation about Christ as a representation of his head and as a didactic device would be brought to bear on the Church, or Christ's body. This extended to apostles as well as saints and martyrs. Literal interpretation of Scripture, therefore, was the starting point of Joachim's hermeneutics. It was the first page of the Abbot's manual for understanding the history and future of mankind.

Inevitably, one must penetrate the meaning of the word to grasp the implied meaning, or spiritual interpretation of Scripture. In essence, Joachim's thought process was quite complex and interwoven into various images, number-patterns, symbols, and Scriptural references. The combinations of these interpretive devices were constantly changing, as Reeves described "Joachim's imagination had a kaleidoscopic quality: the pieces in his mind were always forming new patterns".[7] This began with the seven *etates* that Joachim inherited from Augustine's comprehension of the Seven Days of Creation.

Seven Seals of the book of Revelation signified the seven periods of Old Testament history, which also corresponded to the seven openings in the New Dispensation. This is known as Joachim's pattern of double-sevens. The interface between Judaism and Christianity was expressed in images, in number-patterns, in Scriptural references, and in treatises such as *Adversus Iudeos*. This demonstrates Joachim's complex thought-process, and more importantly, his method for understanding

---

[6] Lerner, *The Feast* 13.

[7] For an excellent interpretation of Joachim's complex thought, see Reeves, *Prophetic* 8-28. This seminal explanation of Joachim's thought-process has been referenced by numerous historians since the monograph's publication.

biblical passages. As Bernard McGinn pointed out, Joachim perceived fifteen different ways (senses) in which to interpret Scripture.[8] This certainly departs from the moral, anagogical, literal, and allegorical Scriptural interpretations of most Christian thinkers in Joachim's day.

To that end, it is necessary to examine what makes Joachim's doctrines so original and multifarious. The first of these doctrines is the "two-fold law". Joachim began with the assumption that all truth came from Scripture. If this were true, Scripture could do more for mankind than instruct and warn: it could forecast the future if one understood it correctly. This is precisely what the "two-fold" principle implies. It stated that every major event in the Old Testament resonated with a parallel event in the New Testament.

Thus, Joachim tallied the accrued years in terms of generations lasting thirty years, all the way from Adam to Christ in the Old Testament, and from Christ to the Apocalypse in the New Testament. If one were to tally the complete number of years before the last generation died away, the Apocalypse was due to take place in the year 1260. The interpretation, then, and not the doctrine itself, posed a threat to the traditional beliefs of the Church Fathers. This was brought to bear in the writings of the Spiritual Franciscans. However, this was only one of Joachim's doctrines which they interpreted and adopted as their own.

According to Robert E. Lerner, Joachim's second innovation was a clear

---

[8] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 123-138.

understanding of the book of Revelation.[9] Roger of Hoveden recounted Joachim's interpretive prowess with the book of Revelation in his *Chronicle*, even though Joachim was at odds with several high-ranking English clerics. As Lerner indicated, the Abbot conceived of a brief period of time between the coming of Antichrist and the final judgement as the refreshment of the saints - a time of a universal reconciliation with the Creator.[10] The Book of Revelation contained the visions which explained the history of the Church in its entirety. The way in which one interpreted the figures in the book of Revelation was a sensitive matter, for if one believed that the papacy or a clergyman was the Antichrist, charges of heresy might ensue. Joachimists would be accused of heresy and brought to trial after the Fourth Lateran Council.

Joachim divided the Book of Revelation into seven stages, or *aetates*, which corresponded to each of the seven heads of the dragon which persecuted Christians throughout history. In fact, Joachim predicted that the sixth *aetas* would begin in 1200, in which a battle would take place between the two groups of spiritual men against the forces of the Antichrist. He also believed in seven different relationships between the three elements of the Trinity, from which the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit would be given to mankind in the third status. In general, as Marjorie Reeves has stated, the mystery of the Trinity was the key to the destiny of all men according to Joachim; this was one of the reasons why he emphasised it so strongly.

---

[9] Lerner, *The Feast* 16.

[10] See Robert E. Lerner, "Refreshment of the Saints: The Time After Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought" in *Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion*, Edwin A. Quain et al, eds., vol. XXXII (New York: Fordham University Press, 1976).

There is no dispute about Joachim's greatest doctrinal innovation: a trinitarian view of history. This breakthrough claimed that all of history can be understood as a pattern of three: the first age or status represented the Age of the Father, when Judaism poured forth its fruits of knowledge and expounded the true meaning of Scripture, represented by the Old Testament. This period began with the creation of Adam and extended into the second status, the time of Christ the Son, who was the Word incarnate. The second status represented the Age of the Son, the incarnation of the Word, the onset of Christian exegesis, and the dawn of the New Testament as the scriptural source of knowledge. During the second status, the New Testament took over where the Old Testament ended. It was a time under the authority of God's law as well as the authority of the Gospels. It also signified the time in which Christ lived. The third status, the age which captured Joachim's interest, represented the Age of the Holy Spirit, a time when the final judgement was realized and when the true spiritual understanding of Scripture would be made known to all of humanity. The third status was connected to the other two and belonged to the Holy Spirit. This status represented the time when the complete interpretation of the Scriptures would be given to the *viri spirituales*. Furthermore, this group of spiritual men was comprised of two groups: one consisted of contemplative monks, the other of the preachers who were to roam the world. After a final battle between Antichrist and God, eternal peace would ensue.

These three periods were also associated to three orders of men who characterized each era. The first status represented the *ordo conjugatorum* where couples were united for the purpose of procreation. The second status belonged to the *ordo clericorum* when

the Word of God would spread throughout the earth. The third status was reserved for the *ordo monachorum* which represented the time of monks who would proclaim eternal peace throughout the world. Joachim saw himself in the third status as a member of the third order: at the edge of the tumultuous final battle between the forces of good and evil which would inevitably lead to eternal peace. All of history led to this final battle, and in this sense, history to Joachim was as much trinitarian as it was a teleological progression. Essentially, Joachim believed in a "three-are-one" nature of the Trinity. He believed that all three elements were linked to one divine essence. Ultimately, this version of the Trinity would put him at odds with Peter Lombard and the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which condemned Joachim's trinitarian views. The Council adopted Lombard's "three-in-one" version that showed a separation of the three constituent parts of the Trinity from a divine essence.

In general, Joachim understood the third status as a time of final fruits, of reaping the harvest of spiritual knowledge which was vital to the salvation of mankind. In this final age of mankind's history, Joachim perceived his own role as one who would instigate the events leading to the final stage of salvation. It was not an age of violence and persecution as much as it was a period of peace and harmony. As I have shown, Lerner was correct to state that Joachim had an irenic vision of the third status, but the membership of those who would partake in the era of peace was debatable. Joachim was interested in the relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit rather than the properties specific to each entity. His unique perception of Church history was rather simple in its most basic form; all of the answers to the mystery of the future were found

in the book of Revelation, as long as one knew how to read it correctly.

Moreover, the Spiritual Franciscans believed they were one of the new groups of *viri spirituales*, or contemplative monks. After Joachim's death in 1202, his works began to circulate beyond Calabria. It is obvious that Joachim's doctrines, however erroneous or innovative, influenced the works of many Franciscans who were predisposed to predict the events leading to the Apocalypse. Beyond the scope of those who espoused common beliefs about the end of time, Savanarola, Dante Alighieri, J. Orosius, and Guilloche tried to interpret who the characters in the book of Revelation most resembled in their own time.[11] Many of these historical figures incorporated a trinitarian view of history in their understanding of the Apocalypse.

What can we make of Joachim's innovations as a general statement about the influence of his thoughts? Judging from his life, Joachim was an extremely expressive spiritual monk who interpreted Scripture as a roadmap to salvation. His thoughts were poignant, and relevant enough that he was able to curry favour with some of the most powerful people of his time. His reputation as '*magnus propheta*' made him out to be a much sought-after visionary who was an authority on the Apocalypse. This made his opinions indispensable to crusaders of the Third Crusade, even though he was not in accordance with the views of other clerics at the time. However, it also assured him the support to help secure the creation of his own order and the writing of his apocalyptic visions.

---

[11] See Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*, for the most comprehensive book on Joachimist influences on Apocalyptic views throughout history.

This much must be granted to an understanding of the Abbot's importance: he had an original and complex understanding of *how* to read Scripture for apocalyptic purposes; his thought was expressed through words and images; he envisioned patterns of twos and threes which represented an innate hermeneutic balance and unity of sacred literature and time periods leading to a final era of peace and brotherhood, with added emphasis on the role of the *viri spirituales*; but his interpretations were general enough to allow for radical constructions of his visions. In essence, Joachim created a template of apocalyptic understanding which favoured the interpretations of monks over others to ascertain the contemporary signposts for the coming third status. Monks were the new spiritual men of Joachim's visions. The two new orders, the contemplatives and the preachers, were the heralds of this future age of apocalypticism. He assigned them to a special place in the process of realizing the idealized end of time. For Dominicans and Franciscans, this was an opportunity to make their own commentaries on the Apocalypse as well as to criticize their contemporaries, both sacred and secular. Thus, not only were Joachim's visions original and widely-applicable, they also could pose a real threat to the traditions and tenets of medieval Christianity by placing greater emphasis on the activities of monks who were predisposed to criticize and accuse authoritative figures throughout Europe. This is precisely what occurred.

As a result, if scholars believe that Joachim was a man who challenged established paradigms on the state of mankind's salvation, they must also account for his links to heresy, either directly through his work or indirectly through the work of his disciples. I contend that Joachim was an innovative thinker during his life, but he was

also a thinker whose ideas were laden with heretical overtones, albeit subtle, for which his disciples and his reputation suffered. It is important to account for both the heretical potential of his doctrines and the true innovation which added to a soteriological understanding.

5. HETERODOXY AND HERESY: THE CONDEMNATION OF JOACHIMISM

The previous chapter explained the innovations of the monk from Corazzo. In this chapter, I hope to demonstrate the importance of Joachim's uniqueness in a Christian milieu by comparing his main Christian doctrines about the history of the church and the salvation of mankind to those of his contemporaries and disciples. In this sense, I mean orthodoxy in the canonical and non-canonical senses of the word. In light of the mixed reaction to his complex ideas about the Apocalypse, I intend to show that Joachim's greatness is found beyond the numerous claims for his orthodoxy.

Much has been made about the heterodoxy/orthodoxy debate. This discourse began with Paul Fournier, who in 1909, claimed that Joachim believed in a Greek type of 'tritheism', and has continued to 2001 with Robert E. Lerner, a supporter of Joachim's essentially 'irenic' third status. According to Marjorie Reeves, this dispute began even earlier with G. Tiraboschi in 1823 when he asked if Joachim were a true or false prophet. It is quite a volatile subject. She correctly concluded "but the question of heresy remains, and recently we have seen that this can yet touch off a lively debate".[1] Others, like A. Crocco, stated that Joachim's condemnation of 1215 still linked Joachim to a heretical scandal now as it did then.[2] Essentially, I agree with Reeves that Joachim probably believed that he was loyal to Christian orthodoxy in all of his works. Once again, the

---

[1] Reeves, *Influence* 127.
[2] Crocco 54.

intention was honest; the interpretation was ultimately problematic. After all, was he a theologian or was he an exegete?

I believe that so much has been made of Joachim's Christian orthodoxy that any effort on my part to discuss matters *pro* or *contra* lead me away from my intended goals. In truth, my argument is directed at a specific type of discourse used by the supporters of Joachim's Christian orthodoxy, and it is this dialogue, part of a larger mindset, that glosses over Joachim's *Adversus Iudeos* treatise. The issue of the dialogue has as much to do with focusing attention on his innovations and positive outlook rather than on Joachim's anti-Judaic sentiments. However, Joachim used the works of the Church Fathers extensively in his works, and at least on that score, it is difficult *not* to engage the orthodoxy debate. This is especially true when one takes into account the reception of Joachimist ideas after his death, and the subsequent link of Joachim's doctrines to heresy. On occasion, I think it will be necessary in a general fashion to talk about the subsequent condemnations levied against the Abbot to prove how innovative his thoughts were; but on the whole, I will try to avoid any direct debate over doctrinal issues, save his dispute with Peter Lombard and the doctrine of the Trinity.

In general, I agree with E.R. Daniel's assessment of the current orthodoxy debate: that it has been ongoing for decades and shows no signs of being resolved any time soon. Daniel stated "defenders of Joachim's orthodoxy argued that his trinitarian theology was completely orthodox and even tried to prove that the treatise condemned at Lateran IV

was a forgery".[3] Scholars who are in favour of Joachim's status as one of the greatest Christian medieval thinkers use a discourse which tends to portray the Abbot in a positive manner, and in this case, any contrary evidence to prove his uniqueness and deviation from the orthodox path is not engaged. A good starting point in the discussion of Joachim's views toward the Apocalypse would be his association with heresy.

Historians of medieval apocalypticism can learn a lot from the facts. The treatment of the condemnations by different historians provides a good indication of scholarly non-engagement. I have already mentioned Joachim's first condemnation in 1192 by the Cistercian house in September. Geoffrey of Auxerre, an old man by that time, launched a bitter accusation against Joachim and his friend Rainier that claimed that the Abbot came from Jewish stock. A letter written by Geoffrey, Bernard of Clairvaux's secretary, condemned Joachim as a "...false prophet of Jewish origin", a charge which is indicative of a discernible anti-Jewish attitude in Western Europe at that time.[4] Joachim's condemnation would not be overturned until 1196 when Pope Celestine III regularized his position against the Cistercians. The condemnation stood for four years before it was redressed by one of Joachim's sympathizers. Obviously, a Cistercian's condemnation carried less weight than a papal condemnation, but Joachim was condemned by one of the most powerful monastic orders in Italy at the time - a considerable attack which came from Joachim's early model for monastic perfection.

Furthermore, the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 was forced to adopt one of two

---

[3] Daniel 131.
[4] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 24.

versions of the Trinity - Peter Lombard's or Joachim of Fiore's. The Abbot outlined his theories on the Trinity in his tract *De Unitate et Essentia Trinitatis* which was eventually condemned as heretical. In the end, the main difference between the two trinitarian paradigms was whether the three elements were separated from a divine essence. Lombard believed in a separation of this essence from its constituent parts, whereas Joachim believed in free access between each entity.[5] In short, Lombard believed in a three-in-one model, rejected by Joachim as *perfidia Petri*, as opposed to the three-are-one model of Joachim. As we have already seen, Joachim also endorsed a three-are-one model of history, and in the end, all ages would agree in an ideal era of peace. This was the very foundation of Joachim's innovative perspective on mankind's history. Having been stripped of any credibility and official endorsement, Joachim's work was ordered seized and destroyed. The Council eventually adopted Lombard's version and condemned Joachim's interpretation, but not the monk himself. Is there a big difference between condemning a work and condemning the man who wrote it? Joachim was still associated with the condemnation, and this must have carried weight with his contemporaries.

In comparison to the 1192 condemnation, this came from a higher ecclesiastical authority. The Scholastics were at odds with Joachim's interpretations. As many historians are careful to note, the work itself and not the man was condemned. Sadly, the little booklet which contained Joachim's attack on the Lombard's interpretation of the Trinity is lost. In the *libellus*, entitled *De Unitate Seu Essentia Trinitatis*, the monk criticized Peter Lombard's separation of all three entities from the divine essence.

---

[5] West and Zimdars-Swartz 6.

Innocent III, a graduate of the Paris theological school, strongly supported the interpretation of the *Libri Sententiarum* written by the Master of Sentences. In the *Damnamus* decree, Innocent proclaimed "*damnamus ergo et reprobamus libellum seu tractum, quem Abbas Joachim edidit contra Magistrum Petrum Lombardum*": the very book in which Joachim accused Peter of outright heresy.[6]

The charge of heresy carried with it a certain stain of guilt which must have made it difficult for people to distinguish the heretical work from its creator. As Marjorie Rèeves noted, " to theologians of succeeding generations this condemnation placed Joachim in a definite category of one who had erred in his theological doctrine".[7] How were theologians to distinguish between the two? For this reason, Honorius III thought it was necessary to safeguard Joachim's name from the accusation throughout Calabria. In 1220, he issued a declaration which affirmed Joachim's orthodoxy: "*eum virum catholicam reputamus*".[8] Major Christian thinkers like Thomas Aquinas took a firm hand with Joachim's doctrines. He forbade any reading of Joachim's work, which he thought was erroneous and suspect. Honorius' clarification of Joachim's importance as a Christian thinker resonates with the scholarly debate today. This is the single most contentious event in Joachimist history; it sparked the lively debate over the Abbot's Christian orthodoxy, because it is potentially the most damaging to his credibility as one of the most influential Christian thinkers of all time. Perhaps one of the most practical methods

---

[6] McGinn, *Calabrian Abbot* 167. "*We condemn and reject the booklet or treatise which Abbot Joachim published against Master Peter Lombard*".
[7] Reeves, *Influence* 33.
[8] See Reeves, *Influence* 32. "*We reflect upon him [as] a catholic man*".

to approach the issue of whether clerics interpreted the work or the Abbot as heretical is to determine how Joachim's ideas were used by his followers. I believe that the perception of Joachim and not the declaration against his work made him seem more heretical.

The Spiritual Franciscans were among the first to rush to Joachim's defence in an attempt to bolster his trinitarian doctrines. They would also suffer the same criticisms that befell Joachim. In fact, the Spiritual Franciscans would become embroiled in debates with the papacy over poverty debates. It is important to analyze their relationship to Joachim and to heresy to demonstrate how Joachimism became intrinsically linked to charges of heresy during the late Middle Ages.

As Joachim once foretold, there would be two new orders that would be created at the beginning of the third status. As the mendicants grew in numbers, some espoused a more radical interpretation of the poverty of Christ. This poverty ideal would combine with the innovative apocalyptic ideas of Joachim of Fiore to become a credo for the Spiritual Franciscans. Gerard of Borgo San Donnino was the first Franciscan to make this connection; the generalates of the order, namely John of Parma and St. Bonaventure, would become divided over the issue, much like the order itself. Petrus Iohannes Olivi would refine these ideas to a new level; and Ubertino da Casale would push the envelope to its fullest extent. This eschatological marathon was run in different stages and the torch was passed to three main participants: Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, Peter Olivi, and Ubertino da Casale. This did not become a race against other orders, but a race toward the final judgement.

The spread of Joachimist ideas happened rather quickly after the Abbot's death. Marjorie Reeves and E.R. Daniel have done an excellent job of tracking the spread of Joachim's doctrine among selected monastic circles in Italy and France. Daniel stated that in the middle of the thirteenth century, a small group of Joachimites, either Cistercian or Florensian, expanded Joachim's ideas through a commentary on Jeremiah, hereafter known as the *Super Hieremiam.* This commentary was renowned for its criticism of papal hopes to re-launch the crusades to the East, despite the heavy losses suffered at the hands of the Saracens.

Why were the Spiritual Franciscans so problematic for the papacy? The story begins with the stated intentions of St. Francis. Francis wrote a farewell testament in 1226 to his brethren in response to his concern over their future in the world. It fulfilled Joachim's prophecy of the creation of new orders. This testament encapsulated and reinforced his views of poverty and manual labour: "When the reward of work (sustenance for services rendered) is not forthcoming, let us return to the table of the Lord in begging door to door...".[9] He warned his brethren to be wary of accepting churches, poor inhabitations, and other fixed constructions made for them, unless they conformed to the strict demands of holy poverty as they had promised in the Rule to live always as wayfarers and pilgrims. He made it an imperative to reject any privilege from the Roman curia for a church, under the pretext of preaching or refuge. This last statement had huge implications regarding the order's relationship to the pope, if one were to interpret it literally. In response, Pope Gregory IX issued the bull called *Quo*

---

[9] Stephen Ozment, *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550* (London: Yale University Press, 1980) 102.

Elongati, in which he declared the Testament invalid in restricting spiritual poverty. The chess game between the Spiritual Franciscans and the papacy had begun in earnest. All Franciscans had a use for things, or *usus facti*. However, what was holy poverty, how closely did the Franciscan order adhere to this ideal, and what did the interpretation of Francis' Testament have in common with Joachim?

In retrospect, one can see how the extraordinary influence of St. Francis fashioned a more austere way of life. His dedication to manual labour, itinerant preaching, and especially poverty was interpreted differently by his order and by the Roman curia. The Testament which he left behind not only expressed a desire for strict observance to his poverty rule, but also caused a rift between his order and the papacy. This rift found a new form in the generalate of the order. A potential departure from the dogmatic Catholic doctrines held by the pope was imminent; it found a voice in Gerard of Borgo San Donnino under the protection of John of Parma. Bonaventure's subsequent efforts to quell this new pseudo-Joachite apocalyptic belief were in vain.

A study of Peter Olivi's basic concepts reveals the true essence of Spiritual Franciscan apocalyptic beliefs. In response to the *usus facti*, Peter developed the idea of *usus pauper*, which stated that evangelical perfection is truly achieved when one takes the vow of poverty.[10] The poverty vow meant that one renounced all dominion, or property rights, like the Conventuals. However, *usus pauper* also placed limits on the use of earthly goods in order to achieve evangelical or apostolic perfection. Peter believed that flagrant and habitual self-indulgence of earthly goods was a mortal sin, and it was

---

[10] Lambert 152.

over this point that Peter differentiated Conventuals or *Relaxti*, from Spirituals (*Spirituales*). He also advocated a new rule to uphold the perfection of the poverty vow, in which moderation was a factor. He claimed that the pope owned earthly goods and that the Franciscans truly owned nothing. This led to a bull created by Pope Nicholas III called *Exiit Qui Seminat*, in which the absolute poverty of the Franciscans was upheld.[11] Peter said that this bull was inerrant and incontrovertible; this is one possible origin of the doctrine of papal infallibility.[12] Thus, Peter helped to draft a bull which confirmed the Franciscan doctrine of absolute poverty as a true form of apostolic perfection. This would have a distinct influence on his apocalyptic and pseudo-Joachite writings. Finally, in 1297, Peter wrote his seminal work *Lectura Super Apocalipsim*.[13] Spiritual Franciscan views of the Apocalypse would be clearly organized and more comprehensible thereafter.

Therefore, this ground-breaking work based in part on the work of Gerard of Borgo San Donnino incorporated the ideals of apostolic poverty, Joachim's time structure, and the second coming of St. Francis as a new messiah. The basis of this work relied on the Joachite version of apocalyptic time progression. There were seven ages of the church, representing a progressive movement of time which led to an apocalyptic end. The sixth period would be a time when evangelicals would actively drive out the Antichrist sect; a time when the final conversion of Jews and Gentiles would take place, signifying the coming of the Apocalypse. This was the extent of Peter's discussion of

---

[11] Lambert 153.
[12] Ozment 110-112.
[13] For the most detailed study of Peter Olivi's work, see David Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: a Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993) 63-178. For selected readings, see Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

Jewish conversion to Christianity. The church would be rebuilt to the standard of its beginnings in the first period. The sixth period would also be the time when prophetic gifts would be given to Joachim of Fiore and St. Francis of Assisi. These seven periods would facilitate the birth of a whole new method of reasoning whereby the Spiritual Franciscans would lead all the faithful into a new era according to Joachim's original prophecy. As he did with the Seven Periods of the church, Peter adopted the Three Ages and the Three Advents of Christ from Joachim of Fiore. Scripture was a roadmap guiding the church to the right path. Jesus would return to earth and preside over the final judgement, representing the third Advent of Christ.

All in all, the first age would expound the great works of the Lord; in the second age, mankind would begin to understand the wisdom of mystical things; and in the third age, no work remains, for it would be a time to praise the great works of Scripture. This also corresponded to Joachim's doctrines. Now that Peter had distinctly organized the significant historical and future apocalyptic movements of the Christian church, he could concentrate on the development of certain themes which clearly explain what was to occur. The conversion of the Saracens leads to another relevant Joachimist theme - numerology, especially the association of St. Francis with the numbers 6 and 13.

Furthermore, through the role of a dual Antichrist, Peter criticized the papacy, the clergy, and the Conventual Franciscans. Peter prefaced his comments about the Antichrist by saying, "Thus in Paris...there was the persecution by those masters who

condemned evangelical mendicancy".[14] There had been a secular movement in Paris led by William St. Amour against the state of absolute poverty adopted by the Spiritual Franciscans. This culminated in the bull *Exiit Qui Seminat* mentioned earlier. This occurred before Peter wrote in 1297, resulting in the "...decretal of Lord (Pope) Nicholas III", whose infallibility Peter supported.[15] Peter commented on other Christian persecutors: the doctors of theology and philosophy in Paris, Peter of Aragon, Frederick II's successors - part and parcel of the "certain other warnings" which would close out the sixth period as a precursor to the seventh.[16] Thus, this work is also a social and religious critique of the state of affairs leading up to 1297. The Antichrist's hordes grew in proportion to the magnification of "...evangelical poverty and perfection".[17] The Mystical Antichrist, as a hybrid of Frederick's seed, five other Christian kings, and a pseudo-pope, would prepare for the coming of the Great Antichrist, or the Devil incarnate. These forces would "...persecute all who wish to observe and defend the Rule purely and fully..." - St. Francis' first Rule.[18] These forces would persecute Spiritual Franciscans, who were the true observers of the Rule.

Consequently, Ubertino adopted and expanded many of Peter's ideas. It was not until 1287 that Ubertino travelled to Florence, where he studied under Peter Olivi at Santa Croce. Olivi began to teach Ubertino about the Joachite prophecies of the Apocalypse. Casale soon became the lector at Santa Croce, but after a brief period, he

---

[14] McGinn, *Visions* 209.
[15] McGinn, *Visions* 210.
[16] McGinn, *Visions* 210.
[17] McGinn, *Visions* 211.
[18] McGinn, *Visions* 211.

realized that he missed his one true love in life - preaching God's word. Therefore, armed with his own opinions about the Apocalypse, he ventured forth into the Tuscan countryside and devoted himself to preaching as the leader of the Spiritual Franciscans in Tuscany. This event initiated a long series of events which would not only rally support behind him, but also make him a papal enemy.

According to Ubertino, Joachimism was to be taken far more literally than Peter Olivi proposed. Olivi was not as vehement or extreme in his criticisms. An examination of his writings will confirm this assessment. However, Ubertino's preaching mission lasted ten years and took him through Tuscany, the Valley of Spoleto, and the March of Ancona. His style of preaching combined the Spiritual Franciscan ideal of poverty (the evangelical ideal) and Joachite prophecies about the Apocalypse. Unlike Peter Olivi, he condemned Pope Nicholas III and Pope Gregory IX for their interpretations of poverty as being moderate and less rigorous. He also condemned Pope Innocent III's disapproval of Joachite prophecies, because Ubertino regarded Joachim as an oracle of the Holy Spirit. Ubertino's general opinions and condemnations led to a summons before Pope Benedict XI who forbade him to preach in Perugia. As a result, he was banished to a hermitage on Mount LaVerna - the same place where St. Francis received his stigmata. During his stay there, Ubertino was inspired to write his seminal work entitled *Arbor Vitae Crucifixae Jesu Christi* in 1305. This work incorporated the general ideas of Joachim of Fiore, in which this sacred tree was rooted in church history, while the branches became the sufferings of Christ and the tree's fruit represented the deeds of the elect. This became a popular work and attracted a lot of support.

Ubertino was extremely critical of the papacy and the clergy. He also attacked his Conventual brethren for not practicing extremist poverty. His theory of future events uses allegorical, theological, and political themes. The resurrection of St. Francis was affirmed to him by Conrada da Offida, who said that Christ raised St. Francis with glorious body to console the Poor Friars, or the Spiritual Franciscans. He wrote, "The pen must now be turned to the offspring of Christ", and his work became "...an abundant and desirable fruit of the remembered tree".[19] Obviously, Ubertino considered himself part of the elect whose work becomes fruit on the tree of the crucified life. He reintroduced the salient themes found in Olivi's work and adopted the same seven-fold pattern which Olivi used based on Joachim's writings. These themes included the church's history, a dual Antichrist, and an angelic St. Francis. He stated that the fifth book of his collection began so that all may arrive by ordered progression to an evangelical way of life renewed in the church by St. Francis; "...indeed, renewed by Jesus himself in Francis".[20] Furthermore, the prophets Elijah and Enoch, preachers in the third Advent of Christ, were metaphors for St. Francis and St. Dominic who preached the second coming or second Advent of Christ.[21] In the sixth period, a renewed evangelical effort to battle the Antichrist will occur, "...under the leadership of poor men who voluntarily possess nothing in this life".[22] This can be taken literally to mean the Spiritual Franciscans. However, if there was one theme which is emphatically stressed, it was the severity with

---

[19] McGinn, *Visions* 212.
[20] McGinn, *Visions* 212.
[21] McGinn, *Visions* 213.
[22] McGinn, *Visions* 212.

which he dealt with clergy.

Moreover, the clergy not only becomes the Mystical Antichrist, but Ubertino took the trouble to name one of these evil men. An evil beast becomes pope and a horde of followers form a second beast which helps the first beast to gain support on earth. These hordes become the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, lectors, and prelates of the clergy.[23] They cured the wound which was inflicted on the first beast in Revelation 13, 3. This Open Antichrist was not mentioned in Olivi's work and signified that perhaps evil was more pervasive and ubiquitous in Ubertino's view than in Olivi's. Furthermore, "...the Open Antichrist will attempt to divide the divine union of Jesus Christ...", representing the division between the Spiritual and Conventual Franciscans.[24] Apparently, he also had it on good authority that Justin the Greek martyr's name for the beast is *Benedictos*, or *Benedictus* in Latin. Ubertino was trying to say that Pope Benedict XI, who sent him to Mount LaVerna and banished him from Perugia, was the beast. Perhaps this can be interpreted as Ubertino's measure of revenge on the pope. However, there was a dual nature to the Antichrist: a destroyer and a deceiver. The deceptive prophet's evil characteristics applied to the pope and the clergy. No suspicion of these false prophets arose, since "...the blindness seems to craze many wise men".[25] Ubertino's conclusions would eventually attract the wrath of the pope.

Upon the completion of this work, Ubertino was called to Avignon to meet Pope Clement V in 1309 to discuss a few issues concerning the Franciscan order. Through this

---

[23] McGinn, *Visions* 213.
[24] McGinn, *Visions* 214.
[25] McGinn, *Visions* 214.

forum, he boldly attacked the pontifical views of poverty which would cause ruin to his order, contrary to the ideal wishes invoked in St. Francis' Testament. Ubertino wanted the Friars Minor to obey the Rule of St. Francis literally. In 1325, he upheld Olivi's writings which had been considered heretical in 1311 by Pope Clement V. Thus, Pope John XXII ordered the Inquisition to arrest him as a heretic. Fortunately for Ubertino, he was able to flee into Germany into relative obscurity before the Inquisition could apprehend him. Once again, writings based on Joachimist tenets became dangerous in the eyes of the pope, and a charge of heresy was the result.

Consequently, the ramifications of the Spiritual Franciscan movement were profound. This can be proven by the number of papal bulls which paralleled the evolution of the movement, especially in regard to St. Francis' Rule about poverty. Two bulls were mentioned earlier: Pope Gregory IX's *Quo Elongati* in 1227 which claimed that every Franciscan still had *usus facti* of material goods, and Pope Nicholas III's *Exiit Qui Seminat* of 1279 declared that the pope owned materials but the Franciscans had use of them.[26] Pope John XXII's bull *Quorundum Exigit* in 1317 changed the perception of Franciscan poverty: "Poverty is great, integrity is greater, and obedience is the greatest good".[27] It was obviously dangerous to adopt an idea which did not strictly coincide with Pope John's. Henceforth, poverty was a state of mind and heart; not literally pertaining to the ownership of worldly goods. In 1322, two bulls called *Quia Non Numquam* and *Ad Conditorem Canorum* denied any distinction between the ownership and the use of

---

[26] Ozment 99-120.
[27] Ozment 99-120.

material goods - what one used, one owned. In 1323, *Cum Inter Nonnulos* claimed that Jesus and the apostles possessed goods privately and communally, and they did not practice the abject poverty that the Spiritual Franciscans practiced. Finally, in 1329, Pope John XXII issued *Quia Vir Reprobus* which claimed that all orders should practice spiritual poverty, not physical poverty. This bull stands today as a part of Roman Catholic law. Therefore, this movement sparked seven separate bulls over the course of 102 years, which still affect Catholicism. This is how the movement affected both the historical perceptions of the past and ecclesiastical law in the future.

We are left with many perceptions of the Franciscan movement and the reception of Joachimist doctrines. Under a general apocalyptic paradigm, the Spiritual Franciscans interpreted the papacy as the Antichrist and themselves as the *viri spirituales* who would assist mankind with the transition from a material and earthly existence to a peaceful spiritual existence in the third status. I have already claimed that the Abbot was an innovative thinker and had an extremely complex way of thinking. However, Joachim was not, by any definition, 'orthodox' in his spiritual hermeneutic, nor was he well-received by standard-bearers of Christian orthodox thought. Although he was referred to as a *magnus propheta*, his work was treated with contempt by the Cistercians and the Scholastics, like the Christian doctor Thomas Aquinas. His interpretations were scrutinized, but repackaged in the works of the Spiritual Franciscans.

Using the book of Revelation as their primary guide, the Spiritual Franciscans not only justified their criticisms of the clergy through Francis' Testament and Joachite doctrines and images, but they also justified their actions through the prophecies of the

Abbot. For the better part of a century, they influenced papal decrees like never before. Thus, Joachim's doctrines were linked to heresy once again, albeit posthumously and indirectly. He does not fit neatly into either category; he is at once orthodox and heterodox. However, the interpretation of his work by the Spiritual Franciscans makes his work, at least, more closely associable to heresy. The Spiritual Franciscans engaged in an activity which sought to relate real people to the allegorical characters of the book of Revelation. Arguably, the papacy had no other recourse than condemnation when its institution was associated to the Antichrist.

This demonstrates the impact of Joachim's writings on the interpretations of some of the most famous Christian writers in the high Middle Ages. Joachim's thought was at once well-received for its exegetical innovation and scorned for its implications against the Church. In part, I would like to emphasize that the debate whether Joachim's writings were heretical or orthodox is *immaterial* to his innovative apocalyptic thought and the influence of his ideas. His writings about Jewish conversion were merely one cog in a highly complex thought-world.

CONCLUSION

"*Hic Abbas Floris, Caelestis Gratiae Roris*" - inscription on Joachim's burial site.

In summation, historians of anti-Judaism have showed how Jews were mistreated in medieval society on account of their religious beliefs. Christians sought to marginalize a Judaic way of life. Blumenkranz and Seiferth showed how this was the final result of a competition between two faiths with one similar goal. Baer cited an earlier precedent of anti-Judaism which predates Augustine, but ultimately, it is clear that there is a strong undercurrent of anti-Judaism in Christianity. Cohen, Stow, and Grayzel take us right up to Joachim's time, when papal authority helped and hindered those who believed in Judaism. If Christians allowed and supported attacks on faith, then Christianity may be held accountable for this general mistreatment. Christian apocalyptic scholars like McGinn subscribe to the notion of a progressive continuity of spiritual thought and use the Church Fathers as their standard-bearers. His conclusions about Joachim fly in the face of the scholarship on anti-Judaism; but he associated everything to the great Christian tradition of apocalypticism which was handed down from Jewish sources. He minimized Joachim's anti-Judaic nature, and made him out to be a passive defender of Christian beliefs. Therefore, McGinn, West, Lerner, and their ilk implicitly suggested that Christianity is no longer liable for the rough treatment of medieval Jews: a conclusion which can only be derived from historians with strong Christian beliefs.

The first chapter explained Joachim's perspective of the Jews and their role in the

final judgement. In part, this formed the basis of an argument in support of the Jewish scholars whose claims contradict the views of Robert Lerner, Delno C. West, Bernard McGinn, and Christian scholars in general. The next chapter sought to reveal the attitude of the Church Fathers toward the Jews to show that Joachim was not as innovative as Lerner might think regarding the Abbot's vision of a Judeo-Christian alliance. It also showed what Joachim's treatise *was not* - an anti-Semitic attack on Jews, in the style of John of Chrysostom's work. It was important to demonstrate the different interpretations of Joachim's exegesis. This preceded the third chapter, in which I attempted to reveal the motives behind the misrepresentation of Joachim's anti-Judaism. Christian historians have manipulated Joachite sources to suit their own needs. At best, their conclusions are tenuous and subject to LaCaprian criticisms of transference and scapegoating. Why has Joachimism been scrutinized according to Christian paradigms?

After discussing what Joachim's work was not, I attempted to explain what it was. The fourth chapter of this thesis focused on the reasons why so many scholars want to study Joachim: for his innovations in apocalyptic thought, his complex doctrines, and his influence. These are the factors that make Joachim of Fiore such a great historical commodity. The next chapter studied his accomplishments and his influence in greater detail, while highlighting themes of Christian condemnation which plagued his work and the work of the Spiritual Franciscans. I tried to demonstrate how Joachim's thoughts were at constant odds with the canonical church toward the end of his life and after his death. Moreover, these charges damaged his reputation with the Church and sparked a prolonged debate about his orthodoxy as a Christian thinker - a debate which still

influences the interpretation of his value as a historical figure.

In retrospect, this is perhaps the only way to reconcile Joachim to Christian orthodoxy in an attempt to make sense of this enigmatic but important historical figure. However, they do so to the detriment of responsible history, for Joachim was much more than a Christian thinker. He used the resources available to him and employed complex thought-patterns to predict what was to come at the end of the world. I would argue that Joachim should not be used as a measuring stick for Christian doctrine; rather, he should be appreciated for his apocalyptic thought and original intellect in the face of established norms. He accomplished a great deal in his life, despite his Christian leanings (or lack thereof). Simply stated, Joachim of Fiore's relevance to medieval history should not be a reflection of his adherence to Christian doctrines or Jewish sympathies, but as a complex thinker with an eye to the salvation of mankind.

Perhaps there is a good reason why Joachim was never given the greatest status any great Christian thinker can achieve: canonization. Granted, Joachim of Fiore has been given a day of observance to mark his achievements (March 30), but he is still excluded from the most prestigious group of Christian contributors throughout history. Was it because his opinions were too radical for his time, or did the condemnation of his work in 1215 and the subsequent condemnations of the Spiritual Franciscans put an eternal stain of heresy on his reputation? As historians, we are fortunate to be able to bypass these obstacles in order to glean what we can from his musings.

Apart from his perception of Christianity and the willingness to find new meaning in ancient texts, Joachim of Fiore is a fascinating historical figure *on his own*

merit. The complexity of his thoughts, the achievements in his life, and the influence he sustains are testaments to his genius. If Joachim were to break free of the binaries into which he has been forced (orthodoxy/heterodoxy, Christianity/Judaism), perhaps his significance as an apocalyptic and historical figure might lead historians to new perceptions of the man as an exegete, as a thinker, and as a spiritual influence. We need not fear the LaCaprian scapegoats and aliens; we must forge ahead to appreciate the man for his unique insights and his ability to synthesize a ground-breaking formula to save souls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Ambrose. *Seven Exegetical Works*. Trans. Michael P. McHugh. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1972.

Augustine. *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*. Trans. Henry Bettenson. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972.

Augustine. *De Civitate Dei Libri XXII*. Vol. II. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1981.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Life and Works of Saint Bernard*. Eds. and Trans. Dom John Mabillon and Samuel J. Eales. London: John Hodges, 1896.

Gioacchino Da Fiore. *Agli Ebrei (Adversus Iudeos)*. Catanzaro: Rubbettino Editore, 1998.

Gregory the Great. *Morals on the Book of Job*. 4 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844.

Hilary of Poitiers. *Trinity*. Trans. Stephen McKenna. Washington: The Catholic University Press of America, 1954.

Jerome. *Homilies on the Psalms*. vols. 1 and 2. Trans. Sister Marie Liguori Ewald. Washington: The Catholic University Press of America, 1964.

John Chrysostom. *Discourse Against Judaizing Christians*. Trans. Paul W. Harkins. Washington: The Catholic University Press of America, 1979.

Roger de Hoveden. *The Annals de Roger of Hoveden Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201*. Trans. Henry T. Reilly. 2nd ed. New York: AMS Press, 1853.

Secondary Sources

Anchel, Robert. *Les Juifs de France*. Paris: J.B. Janin, 1946.

Bachrach, Bernard S. *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Baer, Yitzhak. *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. *The Medieval Papacy*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Bestul, Thomas H. *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.

Blumenkranz, Bernhard. *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental: 430-1096*. Paris: Mouton and Co., 1960.

_____. *Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs*. Paris: Mouton and Co., 1963.

Buonaiuti, Ernesto. *Gioacchino da Fiore, i tempi, la vita, il messagio*. Rome: Collezione Meridionale Editrice, 1931.

Burr, David. *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: a Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Cohen, Jeremy. *The Friars and the Jews*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Crocco, Antonio. *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioachimismo*. Naples: Liguori, 1976.

Daniel, E.R. "Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario" in *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Eds., Caroline Walker Bynum and Paul Freedman. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Douie, Decima. *The Conflict Between the Seculars and the Mendicants at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century*. London: Blackfriars, 1954.

_____. *The Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli*. New York: AMS Press, 1932.

Foberti, Francesco. *Gioacchino da Fiore, Nuovi studi critici sulla misitca e la religione in Calabria*. Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1934.

_____. *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioachinismo antico e moderno*. Padua: Casa editrice dott. A. Milani, 1942.

Fournier, Paul. *Etudes Sur Joachim de Flore et Ses Doctrines*. Paris: Picard, 1909.

Gow, Andrew Colin. *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Grayzel, Solomon. *The Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.

Grundmann, Herbert. *Neue Forschungen über Joachim von Floris*. Marburg: Simons, 1950.

_____. *Studien über Joachim von Floris*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.

Kerstner, Carol. "Ubertino of Casale". *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Online. Internet. 15 Oct. 1998.

Kisch, Guido. *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status*. 2nd. ed. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1970.

Klein, Charlotte. *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*. Trans. Edward Quinn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Criticism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Lambert, M.D. *Franciscan Poverty*. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Langmuir, Gavin. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1990.

_____. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1990.

Lasker, Daniel. *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1977.

Lee, Harold, Reeves, Marjorie, and Silano, Giulio. *Western Mediterranean Prophecy*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1989.

Lerner, Robert E. *The Feast of St. Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

_____. "Refreshment of the Saints: The Time After Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought" in *Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion*. Eds., Edwin A. Quain et al. Vol. XXXII. New York: Fordham University Press, 1976.

_____. Review of *The Calabrian Abbot* by Bernard McGinn, *Speculum* Oct. 1986: 965-968.

Manselli, Raoul. *La 'Lectura Super Apocalipsim' di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi*. Rome: Roma Nella sede dell'Istituto, 1955.

McGinn, Bernard, trans. *Apocalyptic Spirituality*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

_____. *The Calabrian Abbot*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1985.

_____. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Neuman, Abraham A. *The Jews in Spain: Their Social, Political, and Cultural Life*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America,1942.

Oberman, Heiko A. *The Roots of Anti-Semitism*. Trans. James I. Porter. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Ozment, Stephen. *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550*. London: Yale University Press, 1980.

Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*. New York: Atheneum, 1969.

Reeves, Marjorie. *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*. London: S.P.C.K., 1976.

_____. *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Reeves, Marjorie and Gould, Warwick. *Joachim of Fiore and the Myth of the Eternal Evangel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Reeves, Marjorie and Hirsch-Reich, Beatrice. *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Russo, Francesco. *Gioacchino da Fiore e le fondazioni florensi in Calabria*. Naples: F. Fiorentino, 1958.

Seiferth, Wolfgang S. *Synagogue and Church in the Middle Ages: Two Symbols in Art and Literature*. Trans. Lee Chadeayne and Paul Gottwald. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1970.

Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: Etude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain, 135-425*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1964.

Stein, Siegfried. *Jewish-Christian Disputations in Thirteenth-Century Narbonne*. London: H.K. Lewis, 1969.

Stow, Kenneth R. *The "1007 Anonymous" and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the High Middle Ages*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1984.

Synan, Edward A. *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Tondelli, Leone. *Il Libro delle Figure dell'Abate Gioacchino*. Vol.i. 2nd ed. Turin: Società editrice internazionale, 1953.

Trachtenberg, Joshua. *The Devil and the Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

Vanderkam, James C. and Adler, William, Eds. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

West, Delno C. and Zimdars-Swartz, Sandra. *Joachim of Fiore*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.

West, Delno C., ed. *Joachim of Fiore in Christian Thought*. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin and Co., 1975.

Williams, Arthur Lukyn. *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.